

ag

# THE CASE AGAINST ANTI-VIVISECTION

BY

STEPHEN PAGET

LONDON

THE SCIENTIFIC PRESS, LTD.

28 & 29 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.



PRESENTED BY  
*Stephen Paget Esq.*



22900319485

Med

K17736





*BY THE SAME AUTHOR.*

---

**WHAT WE OWE TO EXPERIMENTS  
ON ANIMALS.**

Crown 8vo. limp cloth, 1s. 6d. net; 1s. 8d. post-free.

---

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS, OR OF

**THE SCIENTIFIC PRESS, LTD.**

28 & 29 Southampton Street, Strand, London, W.C.

106.j.D

# THE CASE AGAINST ANTI-VIVISECTION

WITHDRAWN

BY

STEPHEN PAGET

LONDON

THE SCIENTIFIC PRESS, LTD.

28 & 29 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

1904


and  
physiology

14785 199.

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	welMOmec
Call	
No.	QY



THE writer of this pamphlet hopes against hope that it will not give grave offence where no offence is intended. Unhappily for him, it is bound to be aggressive. But there is one thing to be said for it, that it keeps close to its subject, which is the methods, literature, and arguments of the Anti-Vivisection Societies. It is concerned with them, and with nothing else: it puts the case against these Societies, and there stops.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/b28112209>

# CONTENTS.

---

I.—ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETIES.

II.—LITERATURE.

III.—ARGUMENTS.

IV.—“OUR CAUSE IN PARLIAMENT.”



WITHDRAWN

## THE CASE AGAINST ANTI-VIVISECTION.

---

### *I.—ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETIES.*

Some account has been given, in another pamphlet,<sup>1</sup> of the chief discoveries made, by the help of experiments on animals, in physiology, pathology, and bacteriology; but nothing is said there of the way in which these sciences hang together, or of the influences that they have on practice, and practice on them. We are bound to inquire how these many influences work out before we examine the arguments that are advanced against all experiments on animals—bound to admit that the complex structure of medical science and art is not without a plan.

The medical sciences are natural sciences; and, if they are to go forward, they must go forward on the lines of the other natural sciences. They must make experiments: that is what they are here for. Anatomy can hardly make experiments, any more than astronomy; but physiology and bacteriology can, and no power on earth will ever stop them. The physiologists and the bacteriologists must, and always will, work like other men of science; and a laboratory is a laboratory all the world over—neither

<sup>1</sup> "What we Owe to Experiments on Animals." Scientific Press, Limited. 1904. Price 1s. 6d. net, 1s. 8d. post free.

more or less than a workshop, whether its test-tubes contain chemicals or cultures. And in all experiments, whether they be in physiology or in physics, and whether they be in science or out of science, there must be failures and fallacies and oversights; things not seen, or misinterpreted, or found and then lost again, or useless, or half-true; and faults in the heart of the work, imperfect instruments and methods, and defects of human temperament, and conflicting statements, and opposed results. In every science mistakes are made, and for every discovery made there are  $x$  discoveries that were not made.

Again, the medical sciences, being natural sciences, must depend always on other sciences. Thus, in physiology, the study of the central nervous system depended on the science of electricity, the study of digestion on organic chemistry, the study of respiration and of temperature on chemistry and physics; and all of them on the science of the microscope. One natural science cannot go ahead of all the rest. And, as with physiology, so with pathology and bacteriology; the natural science of the processes of disease, like the natural science of the processes of health, must keep in line with the other natural sciences, and in touch with them; and, if they are lagging behind, it must wait till they come up. Take, for example, the work of Galvani, Boyle, Cavendish, Torricelli, and Leeuwenhoek. It seems a far cry from these great names to the physiology of to-day; but physiology had to wait for them all, and to mark time for them. As it were to console the medical sciences for this state of dependence, they keep for ever all that they have once gained for certain. Take, for example, in physiology, the work of Harvey, Pecquet, and Réaumur. It was fifty years before Harvey's work was everywhere accepted; but, once proved, there it is for ever. That the blood does circulate, that the thoracic duct does convey chyle from the lacteals, that the gastric juice does act chemically on food—these and the like old facts will stand till

the end of the world, and all the work of all physiologists will be based on them : our blood will always flow the same way, and our thoracic ducts will always go the same way. In pathology, take the "cell theory" of Schwann and Schleiden ; in pharmacology, Magendie's proofs of the selective action of drugs ; in bacteriology, the work of Koch on tubercle, or of Nicolaier on tetanus. Admit the incompleteness of present results in practice, and all the miserable disappointments on the way to something better ; still, the facts once proved are there for ever, and all present knowledge of these subjects is founded on those facts.

It comes to this, that the medical sciences are a system of natural sciences, bound to make use of experiments, fallible, dependent on other natural sciences, and set to find and prove facts that will stand the test of time. Such a fact may, or may not, come straight out of the experimental method ; and it may, or may not, go straight into the practice of medicine. And if anyone would study the complex, close, and incalculable give-and-take between science and practice, and try to see which is which, let him take a hospital ward and watch each case for a week. He will know then that you can no more draw a hard-and-fast line between science and practice than you can between light and colour. They who attempt to draw such a line are mostly the opponents of all experiments on animals ; and this opposition we have now to consider.

The early history of the anti-vivisection movement is given in a recent pamphlet by Dr. Leffingwell, of Brooklyn, entitled "The Rise of the Vivisection Controversy" ; and in a pamphlet published by the National Anti-vivisection Society, entitled "Dates of the Principal Events connected with the Anti-vivisection Movement," Dr. Leffingwell calls attention to a fact not generally known—that the movement, in this country, was begun by the medical journals. The *Medical Times and Gazette* in 1858, the *Lancet* in

1860, and the *British Medical Journal* in 1861 condemned in a very outspoken way certain experiments made on the Continent, and raised the question whether these or any experiments on animals could be justified. Later, in 1872, the *Medical Times and Gazette* declared outright that all experiments, from the time of Magendie onward, had done nothing for humanity that could be compared to the discovery and use of cod-liver oil and bark. In 1874, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals took proceedings against those who had made certain experiments at Norwich during a meeting of the British Medical Association. These experiments, and the publication of the *Handbook of the Physiological Laboratory*, roused public comment; and during 1875 the opposition to all experiments on animals took more definite form. On June 22nd, 1875, the Royal Commission was appointed; on January 8th, 1876, its report was dated; and on August 15th, 1876, the present Act received the Royal assent.

At the time when the Royal Commission was appointed, the only anti-vivisection society was that which Mr. Jesse had just started; and if anyone will read Mr. Jesse's cross-examination, by Professor Huxley, before the Royal Commission, he will not attach much importance to that society. The National Anti-vivisection Society was founded in November 1875; the Irish Society, the London Society, and the International Association in 1876; the Church Anti-vivisection League in 1889, the Humanitarian League and the National Canine Defence League<sup>1</sup> in 1891, and the British Union about 1898. These dates show that the oldest of these societies came after the Royal Commission, not before it; the first societies and the Royal Commission were alike the expression of a widespread opinion, thirty years ago, that experiments on animals ought either to be forbidden or to be restricted. This same

<sup>1</sup> These two societies have other purposes beside that of opposition, to experiments on animals.



opinion had been expressed, fifteen years before that, by the representative journals of the medical profession. Since 1875 a great deal of water has run under the bridge. We have seen something of the work of the medical profession ; let us now see something of the work of the societies.

---

The chief anti-vivisection societies in this country are the National Society, the London Society, the British Union, the Church League, and the Canine Defence League. In February 1898, the National Society declared itself in favour of restriction ; it set before itself abolition as its ultimate policy, and restriction as its immediate practical policy. Thus, at the present time, these societies are divided into two parties : one asks for restriction, another asks for nothing short of abolition. This division between them, and the tone of the National Society toward the smaller Societies, waste their energy and their funds, and hinder them from working together. The National Society, in its official journal (January 1902), speaks as follows of this schism, in a leader by Mr. Coleridge entitled "The Folly of our Subdivisions" :—

"Nobody seems to know how many Anti-Vivisection Societies there are. A few hundred Anti-vivisectionists divide themselves up into divisions, subdivisions, eoteries, and cliques, without order, without discipline, without cohesion. The Anti-vivisectionists between them all contribute but a few thousands a year, and dribble them around among multitudinous antagonistic associations. . . . The pitiful absurdity of the disunion fostered by some Anti-vivisectionists was illustrated very forcibly last year by the issue of a prospectus of a Society with a world-embracing title, in which its promoters declared that irreparable injury would be inflicted upon our cause if electoral work were not taken up by *them*. . . . The accounts of this stupendous organisation showed that its total expenditure for the year was £13 19s. 4d.,

out of which ten shillings was devoted to 'electoral work.' . . . A much graver injury is done to the cause of mercy by the deplorable waste of money spent in perfectly unnecessary offices and salaries. We say that one office would amply suffice for all the work, and that one office would not need half a dozen paid Secretaries. The existence of many quite needless Societies cannot be justified on any grounds of humanity combined with common sense."

Nothing need be added to these very grave admissions, published by Mr. Coleridge himself. He proposes a very simple remedy for these "quite needless" societies :

"The National Society, as the chief Anti-vivisection organisation in the world, is always ready to put an end to this grievous waste by receiving into its corporation any of the smaller Societies."

But the leaders of smaller societies have two grounds of complaint against Mr. Coleridge's society : they do not believe in his policy, and they will not submit to his "discipline." They call his society "the weak-kneed brethren," and say that its policy is "miserable, cowardly, and misleading"; and they take it ill that he so often accuses them of inaccuracy. He refers again and again (see the official journal of the National Society) to this mode of discipline :—

*December 1901.*—"I decline to be made responsible for the 'anti-vivisection party.' There happen to be small anti-vivisection associations whose chief occupation is the dissemination of quite inaccurate pamphlets. I have nothing to do with them, and cannot prevent anything they choose to do."

*January 1902.*—"Time after time has this sacred cause been undermined and betrayed by its professing friends by their reckless habit of making erroneous statements."

*March 1902.*—"I am quite aware that with many of my opponents in the exclusive total-abolition coterie, the motives that actuate them are far removed from the question of the salvation of the wretched

animals, and have their foundation in emotions that seem to me singularly unworthy and petty."

May 1902.—"As representative of the National Society, I have again and again written to the representatives of some of the smaller anti-vivisection societies, protesting in plain terms against their publication of inaccurate statements."

No society could submit to be thus taken to task four times in six months. The Church League writes to him, "What the Church League may or may not think fit to say does not in the very least concern you, who are not a member of the League. Interference in such a matter from an outsider is an obvious impertinence." Such rejoinders are met, in their turn, by angry leaders, "*A Stab in the Back*," "*Stabs in the Back*," in the National Society's official journal; and the Hon. Secretary of the London Society, who is a lady, is accused of want of chivalry for Mr. Coleridge. The leader, "*A Stab in the Back*" (April 1902), is a curious instance of the tone of one anti-vivisection society toward another:

"The time when a man is assailed by a large section of the press, threatened with violence by laymen, attacked on points relevant by vivisectioners and points irrelevant by their supporters, is scarcely the moment that a generous rival would have chosen for hurling a dart; and yet, incredible as it may appear, the Honorary Secretary of another Anti-vivisection Society, seizing an opportunity afforded by an article in the *Globe*, enters the arena, and, by a letter repudiating any connection with Mr. Coleridge, appears to sanction the unfriendly criticisms expressed in that paper. It needed no chivalry to refrain from writing such a letter. A small amount of good taste would have amply sufficed. . . . This letter, which will convince the public of nothing but the writer's lack of taste, might well be ignored were it not that it is but one of the many attacks made by members of other societies, either by open statement or innuendo, against the Honorary Secretary of the National Society."

There is a want of proportion here. The National Society charges this or that smaller society with reckless inaccuracy, and declares *urbi et orbi* its own infallibility. Most of the smaller societies, it says, are absolutely unnecessary : it would gladly incorporate them all, and do the work of all of them. And then one of the smaller societies dares to say a word for itself ; and oh the outcry in the camp of the Philistines ! Our Goliath has been hit ; stabbed in the back by the London Society : what a want of chivalry, what bad taste, what a moment to choose !

But we cannot wonder at these occasional stabs. For the National Society does not stop at charging other societies with inaccuracy. It makes yet graver charges against them. Here are three made by Mr. Coleridge's society against Miss Cobbe's and Mr. Trist's societies :

*March 1901.*—"The February number of the *Abolitionist* contains a leading article in which allusions are made to subjects that are never discussed by decent people even in private. As the leading organ of the Anti-vivisection movement, we enter our solemn protest against the publication of this unspeakable article, which must inevitably inflict the gravest injury upon our cause."

*February 1903.*—"It is our duty to inform our readers that Mr. Trist has published the correspondence, but that he has mutilated it, omitting some of his own letters altogether, and excising whole paragraphs of Mr. Stewart's letters."

*June 1903.*—"Our amiable contemporary, the *Abolitionist*, is good enough, in a long article in its last issue, to suggest to those preparing the libel action against Mr. Coleridge what are the most vulnerable points in his armour. We hope this solicitude for Mr. Bayliss's success will not be misunderstood by our contemporary's readers."

Thus divided in policy, and at variance among themselves, these societies are still agreed in appealing to the public for approval and for money. Here the



London Society's opposition to the National Society comes out clearly. In its annual report (1903) the London Society says :

"Join a really effective Society with a frank and straightforward policy—namely, the London Anti-Vivisection Society, 13 Regent Street, London, S.W. This is a National and International organisation. It has greater medical support than any other. It is the most 'alive' humane organisation in the world. . . . Get into touch with the society. Write to us. We shall be glad to hear from you and answer any questions."

"If you can provide for the Society's future in your Will, may we beg of you to do so? If you agree, pray do it now. Thousands of pounds have been lost to the Society and the Cause by the fatal procrastination of well-meaning friends. The pity of it! Legacies should be left in these *exact* words: 'To the *London Anti-vivisection Society.*' CAUTION. It is of great importance to describe very accurately the *Title of this Society*—namely, THE LONDON ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY—otherwise the benevolent intentions of the Donor may be frustrated. PLEASE NOTE.—Those Charitable persons who have left money to the Society would do well to notify the same to the Secretary."

Contrast the tone of this appeal for money with the tone of the Report :

"Your Society are glad to note that the Christian Churches are becoming alarmed at the pretensions of scientific authority. . . . The Christian laity has been largely uninstructed or misinformed on this grave question. . . . Happily, the signs of the times are propitious ; not all of the leaders of religious thought in this country have succumbed to the dictation and pretensions of the professors of vivisection . . . a base and blatant materialism, a practice which owes its inception to barbarism, and which has developed in materialism of the lowest possible order."

Surely such eloquence should avail to tear the

money even out of the hands of the dying, lest the National Society should get it. The National Society, oddly enough, also says: "CAUTION.—It is of great importance to describe very accurately the *Title of this Society*—namely, THE NATIONAL ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY—otherwise the benevolent intentions of the Donor may be frustrated." I do not know which of these two societies is the inventor of this phrase. Still, it is not improbable that the National Society receives more money than all the smaller societies together. Of course, we cannot compare the working expenses of an anti-vivisection society with the working expenses of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. The former of these two societies last year obtained 8,798 convictions; in one month alone, 689 convictions; and it paid the full costs of committing 34 of the 689 to prison. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children has an equally good record. But an anti-vivisectionist society cannot show results of this kind. Nor can we compare its working expenses to those of a missionary society; for the missionaries give direct personal service to their fellow-men. But we can fairly compare the works of an anti-vivisection society to those of an anti-vaccination society or of a Church of Christian science. That is to say, words are their works. In 1902, the National Society's expenditure, in round numbers, was £970 on printing and stationery; £1,193 on rent, salaries, and wages; £1,255 on books, newspapers, periodicals, etc., including the *Illustrated Catalogue* and the *Hospital Guide*; £1,380 on lectures, meetings, organising new branches, etc.; and about £500 on all other expenses. Let us take, to illustrate these figures, what the National Society says from time to time in its official journal:—

*June 1899.*—(From the Society's Annual Report. The reference is to a series of articles in the *National Review*, by Professor Schäfer and Mr. Coleridge):

“The whole controversy has been collected and published in pamphlet form by your Society, and more than 10,000 copies have already been issued to the public. Over 200 people have joined your ranks and become members of the Society in consequence of it, while two cheques of £1,000 each were received by Mr. Coleridge in aid of the cause.”

*June 1899.*—(An interview of the secretary by a reporter for the *Echo*): “We have received more money within the past six months than we got in any two years previously.”

*June 1899.*—“We cannot better employ the funds at our disposal than in securing the constant help of experts to insure the accuracy of all our statements, and in sending well-informed lecturers to every city in the kingdom.”

*June 1900.*—(From the Society’s Annual Report): “The receipts of the society from subscriptions and donations show an increase over those of the previous year. This increase in itself, however, would hardly have justified the increase in the expenses which it has been found necessary to incur in almost every department, and especially in the distribution of pamphlets and papers, had it not been for some legacies which fell due, notably one from —, of £6,386.”

*May 1901.*—“With heartfelt gratitude we have once more to announce that the National Society has received a gift of a thousand pounds from an anonymous donor. Nothing could be more opportune for the Cause than this munificent support, coming as it does just as the issue of 20,000 copies of Mr. Stephen Coleridge’s *Hospital Guide* has been made at so great a cost to the Society.”

*June 1901.*—“Our editorial table is buried deep in press cuttings from all parts of the kingdom.”

*June 1901.*—(Mr. Coleridge’s speech at the annual meeting): “I hold in my hand a little publication, that some of you may have seen, for which I am personally responsible. . . . If you will put me in a

position to do so, I will see that every subscriber to every London hospital receives a copy in the course of the next few months."

*January 1902.*—"During that particular year (1900?), the National Society spent £888 13s. 2d. in purely electoral work. . . . There are no less than four other separate Societies which each spend more than £200 a year in rent and salaries."

*March 1902.*—"We employ two press-cutting agencies to send us cuttings from the journals of the whole English-speaking world."

*July 1903.*—"We start branches in various towns, and send lecturers to speak at working men's clubs and debating societies. All this means a very large expense. We very often issue a pamphlet likely to do good by the tens of thousands. Last year we issued 50,000 copies of the 'Illustrated German Catalogue of Vivisectional Instruments and Appliances.'"

The smaller societies, of course, spend their funds in the same sort of way. Thus the National Canine Defence League, in its latest report, says that its anti-vivisection work, the most important of all its works, is earnestly carried forward by (1) The Writer's League, in a ceaseless flow of letters to the press; (2) The circulation of lists of hospitals free from the shameful practice; (3) The publication of twenty-one strong leaflets on the subject; (4) The circulation of 300 copies of a book on the subject. This society in two years sent out 650,000 leaflets and pamphlets; but they were not all of them about experiments on animals. Another Society, in a report published in 1902, enumerates the methods which it employs for "the education of the public at large." These include (a) the publication of literature; (b) the holding of public meetings in all parts of the United Kingdom; (c) the delivery of lectures with or without limelight illustrations; (d) participation in debates even with high scientific authorities; (e) inducing the clergy and ministers of all Churches to



deliver sermons dealing with the subject ; (f) organisation of a press bureau, through which the newspaper press of the country is watched, and correspondence and articles contributed. This Society has also a van, "the only one of its kind in existence. No sooner is our winter and spring campaign concluded than the van takes up the thread of the work and carries it on through the summer, and it may truly be said that the track of the van across country is white with the literature which the van circulates on its educational mission."

It is evident, from these and the like statements, that these Societies, during the last quarter of a century, have published a vast quantity of literature. We must examine the style of that literature during the last few years, and the arguments which it puts forward. But, before we do this, let us consider what attitude is taken by these Societies, or by well-known members of this or that Society, toward certain problems and interests that closely concern them.

1.

They do not hesitate to take advantage of all those improvements of medicine and surgery which have been made by the help of experiments on animals. They denounce the work of the present ; but they enjoy all the results of the past, and will enjoy all those of the near future. "If anything of value to medicine has been discovered by vivisection, it would be as absurd to reject it on that account as it would be to abandon Ireland because centuries ago we took it by force." And again : "We are no more morally bound to reject benefits acquired by indefensible means than are the descendants of slaveholders bound to abandon wealth originally acquired by the detestable abomination of slavery." And again, the *Animal's Friend* (November 1903) takes as further instances the benefits derived from body-snatching, political assassination, and the French Revolution. But, in the matter of experiments on

animals, it is the very same men and women who denounce these experiments and who profit by them. What should we say of an anti-slavery reformer who was himself drawing a vast income out of the slave trade ?

But there is one gentleman, and, so far as I know, only one, who did carry his opinions into practice. He told the story, a few weeks ago, at a debating meeting—how his little girl had a sore throat, and the doctor wanted to give antitoxin ; and he forbade it, and the child recovered. “Of course,” he says, “it was only an ordinary sore throat.” Truly, a great victory, and a brave deed, to make an experiment on your own sick child.

## 2.

The attitude of these Societies toward sport may seem at first sight purely negative ; but it is worth study. I have the honour of knowing a very eminent physiologist who will never shoot, because he thinks it cruel—a man much abused and hated by the National Society. And Lord Llangattock, the President of that Society, is well known as an “ardent sportsman.”

This contrast is of some interest. Let us see what the National Society says about sport. Of course, it is not bound to attack sport. But the reasons which it gives for remaining neutral are to be noted.

1. It says, very truly, that it is in great part supported by sportsmen ; and that it would lose many votes in Parliament if it ran a-tilt against sport.

2. It says, further, that the cruelties of sport lie outside its own proper work :—

“Our opponents frequently ask us why we do not attack some form of cruelty other than vivisection, which they consider more heinous. Our Honorary Secretary recently summarised this argument in his own amusing manner thus : We must not arrest the man in Tooting for kicking his wife till we have stopped the woman in Balham starving her children,

and we must not arrest the woman in Balham for starving her children until we have stopped the man in Tooting kicking his wife." (1901).

Later (1903) the *dramatis personæ* are a man in East Islington jumping on his wife, and a woman in West Islington stabbing her husband. But this argument, of course, will not hold. For it is the same men who denounce wounds made (under anæsthetics) for physiology, and who make wounds (without anæsthetics) in sport. What should we say of a magistrate who sentenced a prisoner, and then went home and committed an identical crime?

3. It says that the "object" of the sportsman is to kill, but the "object" of the experimenter is to torture:—

"There is a vast difference between the killing of animals and the torturing of them before killing them. The object of the sportsman is to kill his quarry; the object of the vivisector is to keep his victim alive while he dissects it."—Mr. Wood (1903).

"The object of the sportsman is to kill, and the object of the vivisector is to keep his victim alive while he cuts it up."—Lord Llangattock (1901).

"The vivisector is nothing if not a tormentor; the sportsman is not a true sportsman if he seeks to inflict pain on his quarry. . . . One (the pain of a horse falling on asphalte) is the result of an accident to be deplored, the other (the pain from an experiment) is done of devilish malice prepense."—Leader in the Society's official journal (1899).

"I am not so mentally and ethically confused as to be unable to distinguish between the entirely different moral acts of killing and torturing."—Mr. Coleridge (1901).

Here are four statements. One is by Mr. Wood, the Society's lecturer; one by Lord Llangattock, its President; one is published in its official journal; and one is by Mr. Coleridge, its honorary secretary and treasurer. That is the sort of thing which seems

good enough to the National Society to say to its friends in Parliament ; this childish nonsense about the true sportsman and his quarry.

## 3.

The attitude of these Societies toward the medical profession, and toward the Hospitals, must be studied. Let us go through some numbers of the official journal of the National Society, and see the attitude that it sometimes takes toward the medical profession :—

*June 1899.*—"The charm of this sort of thing is that you are always sure of the *post-mortem* if of nothing else."

*July 1899.*—"There is a disease, well known to the vestrymen of London, called 'the half-crown diphtheria.' This is common sore throat, notified as diphtheria because the vestry pays a fee of half-a-crown to the medical notifier."

*December 1899.*—"The patient died, made miserable by the effect of inoculations which even on bacteriological grounds gave no promise of success, but the scientific physician, nowadays, must inject something in the way of a serum."

*March 1901.*—"There will always be those who, unable to think for themselves or exercise their independence on therapeutic methods, are prone to bow down before authority which is self-assertive enough to compel the obedience of weak minds. Such men would inject antitoxin though every case died. They administer it not knowing why."

*April 1901.*—(From "Our Cause in the Press") : "What effort does the medical profession make to make clear to its clients what is well known to itself, that disease is the result of wrong living ? Practically none at all. The medical profession as a whole have winked at sin, and have merely sought to antidote its results."

*June 1901.*—"The cutting mania of the modern surgeon is certainly the outcome of the passion for

vivisection. The public is blissfully ignorant for the time that the knife and forceps of the animal-torturer only await a favourable opportunity to go to work on their own flesh and bones. . . . Our crusade on behalf of the animals is also a crusade of mercy to our fellow-men."

September 1901.—"Some day we shall have our surgeons disembowelling us just to see what daylight and fresh air will do for the stomach-ache."

December 1901.—"The new medicine demands a mere laboratory habit; the patient is nothing, the disease everything. He is a test-tube; such and such reagents are needed to produce a certain result, and there you are. The patient's malady, be it what it may, is due to a microbe, a toxin, or a ptomaine; he must be inoculated with the serum or antitoxin which counteracts his disease, and this must be done not *secundum artem* but *secundum scientiam*, and the science means the inoculating syringe and so many cubic centimetres of filth wherewith to poison the man's blood and so cure his disease, though the victims die."

December 1903.—(From "Our Cause in the Press"):  
"Not only did we see great callousness in the field hospitals in South Africa, but conversation with the class that finds its way into our hospitals in England will reveal that a great deal of refined cruelty is constantly occurring."

Why does the official journal of Mr. Coleridge's society publish these things? For this reason—that it must attack those methods that were discovered by the help of experiments on animals. The medical profession uses these methods. Therefore, that profession must be attacked.

The same reason, of course, helps to explain the National Society's attack on the great Hospitals of London. It would take too long to tell here the whole story of that attack. Three charges are made against the Hospitals: (1) that they maltreat patients; (2) that they promote the torture of animals; (3) that



they endow this torture at the cost of the patients. They are accused, to put it plainly, of treachery and fraud; and of course the Council of the King's Hospital Fund gets its share of abuse. But, after all, the attack fails; for it defeats its own ends. I speak of it in the present tense, but its force is spent: it did not hurt the Hospitals, and it tended to weaken the cause of the National Society. The main facts about it are known to everybody; the distribution of the *Guide to the Charitable*, and the interference with the churches on Hospital Sunday, and all the rest of it. Mr. Coleridge said on this subject:—

1. (Annual meeting at St. James's Hall, May 1901): "How have Lord Lister, the vivisector, and his Committee distributed the Prince of Wales's Hospital Fund? They have so distributed this fund as to make it clear to hospital managers that the more they connect their hospitals with the torture of animals the larger will be the grant they may expect to get from the Prince of Wales's Fund. That Fund, therefore, has been used as an insidious but powerful incentive to vivisection."

2. (Annual meeting at St. James's Hall, 1902): "Sheltering itself now in its most repulsive form behind those ancient and glorious institutions, founded and sustained for their Christ-like work of healing the sick, sapping their foundations and smirching their fair fame, malignant cruelty has taken up its position in its last ditch. There it has summoned to its aid vast interests, ancient prejudices, enormous endowments, and under illustrious patronage it has pilfered the funds subscribed for the poor."

With these statements before us (and it would be easy to add to them) we cannot doubt that the plan of campaign against all experiments on animals is also hostile to the Hospitals, whenever that hostility seems likely to be of the very least use to the cause. Finally, let us note the present attitude of the National Society toward the Hospitals. A recent

number of its official journal (February 1904) makes the following announcement :

#### MEDICAL EDUCATION.

" As a result of Mr. Coleridge's criticism of the finances of the great hospitals of London to which medical schools are attached, an important movement is on foot to transfer the teaching of anatomy, physiology, etc., to the London University."

---

Surely there are charities more worthy of subscriptions, donations, and legacies than these Anti-vivisection Societies. They do not work well together; they spend the money on offices, salaries, press-cuttings, reprints, lectures and meetings, tons of pamphlets and leaflets. Their members denounce all experiments done now, while they enjoy the profit of all experiments done before now; they say that the object of the physiologist is to torture his victim out of devilish malice prepense; they accuse doctors of fraud, and lying, and refined cruelty, and madness, and winking at sin; they blacklist and boycott the best Hospitals. And the whole costly business, these thirty years, has done nothing to stop these experiments; they have increased rapidly—six out of seven of them are bacteriological, and even the Societies are beginning to believe in bacteriology. Surely, if a man wishes to help and comfort animals, he had better give his money to the Home for Lost Dogs, or the Home of Rest for Horses.

---

## II.—LITERATURE.

We have now to examine the style of the literature of these societies ; and, in the next chapter, the value of its arguments. We must judge the tree by its fruits, and practically this literature is its only fruit. But, out of such a vast store of journals, pamphlets, and leaflets, we can only take one here or there.

From time to time a book or a pamphlet is, for good reasons, withdrawn. Thus, in 1902, the London Society withdrew *Dark Deeds*. (The *Shambles of Science*, recently impounded, was published by a chairman of committee of the National Society, but not by that society.) In 1900 the National Society withdrew one or more pamphlets involving acceptance of Dr. Bowie's mistranslation of Harvey. In 1902 it withdrew and destroyed a whole store of diverse pamphlets, and appealed to its supporters to "refrain from circulating any literature not issued from our office by the present committee"; that is to say, it warned them to distribute no literature but its own, and not all even of that. But the withdrawal of a few books and pamphlets makes very little difference ; and most of them are "revised" and brought out again. Take, for example, the *Nine Circles*. It was planned and compiled for Miss Cobbe ; Mr. Berdoe was "urgently requested by her to point out to her any scientific errors or possible inadvertent misrepresentations of fact, and correct or expunge them"; and he "carefully read through the proof-sheets." The book purported to be an exact account, from original sources, of certain experiments, some made abroad, some in this country. It was attacked by Sir Victor Horsley at the Church Congress at Folkestone, October 1892, and was withdrawn, revised, and brought out again. Let all that pass: our only concern here is to see what the official



journal of the National Society said of the revised issue. This official journal, the *Zoophilist and Animal's Defender*, was started in May 1881, under the shorter title of the *Zoophilist*. It speaks of itself as a "scientific journal," and as "the recognised organ of the anti-vivisection movement in England." It is published monthly, and may be obtained through any bookseller. In 1883 it was edited by Miss Cobbe; in 1884 by Mr. Benjamin Bryan; in 1898 by Mr. Berdoo, the present editor. In 1903, Mr. Coleridge, apologising for an error made in it in 1898, says, "At that time I had not the control over its pages that is at present accorded to me." Thus it is edited by Mr. Berdoo, and is, or was last year, controlled by Mr. Coleridge. And we are bound to note here that Mr. Berdoo was in great part responsible for the *Nine Circles*; and in 1897 was responsible for certain statements as to the use of euraire which the Home Secretary, in the House of Commons, called "absolutely baseless."

Let us now examine the style of this "official journal." And, to begin with, what does it say about the *Nine Circles*? To make this point clear, let us put in parallel columns what was said by Sir Victor Horsley of the original edition in 1892, and what was said by the *Zoophilist* in 1899 of the revised edition:

*Sir Victor Horsley, Oct. 1892.*

I have taken the trouble to collect all the experiments in which cutting operations are described as having been performed by English scientists, and in which I knew anæsthetics to have been employed. These experiments are 26 in number. In all of them, chloroform, ether, or other anæsthetic agent was employed. But of these 26 cases, Miss Cobbe does not mention this fact at all

*The "Zoophilist," July 1899.*

A revised edition has been issued, which is a stronger indictment against the vivisectioners than the original work. There were some half dozen omissions in the first edition concerning the administration of anæsthetics in the preliminary operations, but the cruelty of the experiments was in no case modified by the fact that a whiff of chloroform was possibly administered, as stated

in 20, and only states it without qualification in two out of the remaining six. When we inquire into these 20 omissions in the 26 cases, we find in the original that again and again Miss Cohhe has, in making her extracts, had directly under her eyes the words "chloroform," "ether," "etherised," "chloroformed," "anæsthetised," "during every experiment the animal has been deeply under the influence of an anæsthetic," and so forth.

in the reports at the beginning of the operation. Our opponents may boast of their success in detecting the omission to dot the i's and cross the t's in the first edition of the *Nine Circles*, but there are some victories which are worse than a defeat. We have replaced the lantern with which we examined the dark deeds of the laboratories by the electric searchlight. The "researcher" will find it hard to discover a retreat where its rays will not follow and expose him.

For another instance of the inaccuracy of the *Zoophilist* we have what it said about Professor Sanarelli's experiments in South America on five human beings. Nobody defends him here. But the point is that the *Zoophilist* in 1899 said that they had all been killed; and in 1902 admitted that they had all recovered. Or, for another instance, we have what it said in 1902 about the ease of His Majesty the King. (For these statements, see *Zoophilist*, August 1902 and September 1903; also its report, October 1902, of Mr. Wood's speech at Exeter.)

But let us take a wider view. A journal, like a man, is known by the company that it keeps. Whose company does the *Zoophilist* keep? Why does it talk of *Our excellent cotemporary, Humanity—Our valiant cotemporary, Le Médecine—Our excellent cotemporary, The Herald of the Golden Age?* Again, among the journals that it quotes, some of them very frequently, are the *Topical Times*, *Broad Views*, *Modern Society*, *Madame*, the *Humanitarian*, the *Pioneer*, the *Vegetarian*, the *Voice of India*, the *Herald of Health*, the *Rock*, the *New Age*, the *Journal of Zoophily*, the *Homœopathic World*, *Medical Liberty*, and the *Honolulu Humane Educator*. This may be very good company, but it is not all of it the best

company for a "scientific journal." Still, it may be better company than the American *Medical Brief*, the *Journal de Médecine de Paris*, and the Belgian *Le Médecine*. These journals, being veritable "medical journals," are quoted in the *Zoophilist* with the most amazing frequency and at great length; which is a compliment that they do not receive from other medical journals. They are, indeed, as vehemently anti-Pasteur and anti-antitoxin as the *Zoophilist* itself. Take what the *Medical Brief* says:—

"Antitoxin is an invention of the human mind. It was evolved from the 'inner consciousness,' and has no relation to facts. . . . All sane logic refutes the possibility of poisoned horse serum, depraved by a septic process going on in the horse, having any power to control the symptoms of disease . . . merely tainted horse water . . . a means of scientific pretension and self-advertisement to medical pharisees in the profession, who depend upon pedantry and fads, which impress the credulous, to obtain them patronage, instead of real knowledge. Tell the people the truth about antitoxin, Doctor, and so help get rid of this fraud."

"Bacteriology originated in Continental Europe, where the minds of a superstitious race were further unbalanced by constant delving in pathology, putrefaction, and morbid anatomy. When it spread to the new world, it also became blinded with the revolutionary and fanatical tendencies lying near the surface in such a civilisation."

"They say if you give a calf rope enough, he will hang himself. Bacteriology is equally clumsy and stupid. . . . What excuse can be found for the cowardice and ferocious ignorance which, under the shadow of the stars and stripes, resurrects the sentiment of the middle ages to protect the fraud, seeks to rob the individual physician of free judgment, and denounces him for failing to use the nasty stuff?"

"All Continental Europe is suffering from a sort of

leprosy of decadence, mental and moral. The spiritual darkness of the people affects all the learned professions, but more especially medicine."

Such is the *Medical Brief*, which the official journal of Mr. Coleridge's Society quotes incessantly, calling it "an American monthly of great ability and without a trace of the scientific bigotry and narrow-mindedness which is so prominent a feature in some of our own organs of medical opinion." Next we come to the *Journal de Médecine de Paris*. This is anti-Pasteur; the editor, Dr. Lutaud, came to London in 1899, and gave a lecture on "the Pasteur superstition" at St. Martin's Town Hall. From a report of it in the *Star* we may take the following sentences:—

"Dr. Lutaud traced the progress of the Pasteur mania. It was not necessary to torture hundreds of guinea-pigs in order to produce serum. It was sufficient to artificially produce a serum of chloride of sodium (common salt) and distilled water, which would not have the weakening effect on patients that attended the use of animal serum. The result of the serum craze had been that the hospital was neglected for the laboratory. Microbes of all the diseases were found in perfectly healthy subjects. Microbes existed, but as a consequence, not a cause. Toxins which the seropaths professed to find were only the results of normal fermentation. The English public had always supported him in his fifteen years' struggle against Pasteurism."

Dr. Lutaud, says the National Society, is "the great authority." The *New England Anti-vivisection Monthly* in 1900 calls him one of "the brightest scientists of modern times." His *Journal de Médecine de Paris* recalls the *Medical Brief*:

"To wish to apply the same methods of treatment, whether preventive or curative, for two morbid conditions (a wound with the point of entry abnormal and an infectious *malady*) in essence so different, is to commit a gross error. . . . The sick are destroyed by that which cures their wounds."



“In the kingdom of Morticolia the clinicians are the humble servants of the eminent bacteriologists ; they wear the livery of their masters, they speak the language of their masters ; there is no reason to foresee that they will ever be prepared to claim their independence and escape from the ferule.”

These two “medical journals,” the *Medical Brief* and the *Journal de Médecine de Paris*, are upheld by the National Society as though they were expert witnesses of irresistible authority, and are quoted with a sort of ceaseless worship in that Society’s official journal. Also it quotes the *Herald of Health*, and *Medical Liberty*. Of this latter journal it says :

“The medical journals of the United States are edited on more outspoken and liberal lines than those of our English medical press. *Medical Liberty*, says the *Animal’s Defender*, is ‘a monthly publication issued by the Colorado Medical Liberty League, Denver, Colo., whose eloquent editor seems to be an uncompromising foe to medical bigotry and monopoly, and humbugs of every description.’ ”

Such are the medical journals which support the *Zoophilist* as a scientific journal. Now let us take another point of view. Let us consider whom the *Zoophilist* praises, and whom it condemns. That, surely, is a fair test of an official journal. And we get a clear result. The late Lord Salisbury and Mr. Arthur Balfour are “notoriously pro-vivisectionist” ; Lord Lister has “apostatized from the anti-septic faith” ; M. Pasteur is a “remorseless torturer” ; the late Mr. Lecky was “degenerate,” because he “performed the *volte-face* and went over to our opponents” ; and the late Professor Virchow was subjected to “scathing criticism” by one Paffrath, and was proved to be absurd. But its praises are given to a very different set of men, above all to Mr. Coleridge, whom it loves to praise. There is no room here to note the lighter moods of the *Zoophilist* ; its jokes about cats and catacombs, and two-legged donkeys and four-legged donkeys, and how to

catch mosquitoes by putting salt on their tails—and it will even *break its jest on the dead*—but it rebukes another journal for levity, saying, *We regret to see our painful subject treated in this manner.* No room, either, for its description of anti-vivisectionist plays, poems, novels, and sermons. Let us, to finish with, take a few statements from its pages, almost at random ; some of them are reprinted there from other sources. The supply is endless ; let us limit ourselves to seven of them :—

1. “As other bacteria (beside those of malaria) were found not to bear sunlight or air, but to habitats in *loca scuta situ* (? to inhabit *loca senta situ*), in filth and noisomeness, their habits and customs preached again the old doctrine, ‘Let in sun and air and be clean,’ as earnestly as those who thought health was due to sun and air and water and fire, the four old elements, and act accordingly, without dissecting hecatombs of animals to prove a thousand times over that if you boiled or baked or drowned or froze living creatures they would die, or that microscopic parasites did pretty much what visible parasites have been always known to do.” (Loud applause.)—Report of a speech by the Bishop of Southwell (1901).<sup>1</sup>

2. “It is just as well that you should have heard what the clever level-headed lawyer (Mr. Coleridge) thinks about this abominable conspiracy of cruelty and fraud and impious inquisitiveness which is called vivisection. (Cheers.) . . . We are sending out on the world in every direction multitudes of young men who have been trained as surgeons, and they have lived by cutting (reference here to the medical students in *Pickwick*), and we are sending these young men out with this *cacoëthes secandi*, this mania for cutting for the mere sake of cutting. I should not be surprised if they tackle our noses or our ears.

<sup>1</sup> This was at the meeting at Derby, Oct. 23, 1901, which was followed by Mr. Coleridge's unsuccessful action for libel against the Rev. Mr. Macdonald. Truly, *Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.*

and set about mutilating us in that way.”—Archdeacon Wilberforce (1901).

3. “The task of the crusader against vivisection is not to reason with the so-called scientist, not to truckle to pedants in the schools, or palter with callous doctrinaires, but to inform and arouse the people; and when John Bull is prodded from his apathy, and startled from his stertorous snore, he will rise and bellow out a veto on the elegant butcheries of pedantic libertines, and rush full tilt with both his horns against their abattoirs of cruelty and passion, pharisaically vaunted as research, until the gates of hell shall not prevail against him.”—The Rev. Arthur Mursell (1901).<sup>1</sup>

4. “It has been my experience of anti-vivisection among Romanists, that nothing suited my purpose better than taking it for granted that the worshippers of St. Francis, St. Bernard, etc., must, *of course*, be on our side.”—Anonymous (1902).

5. “Given money, and influential patronage, the vivisector now expects a time after his own heart, while professedly engaged in investigating the supposed causes of cancer, or the transmissibility of tuberculosis. He can inflict the most horrible and prolonged tortures on miserable animals, with such a plausible excuse in reserve, that he is endeavouring all the while to find cures for the ailments of high personages and millionaires.”—*Modern Society* (1902).

6. “Vivisection is the outcome of materialism. A comparatively new goddess is now being worshipped—the goddess of science. The temple is the laboratory, the victims are the tortured dogs sacrificed on her unhallowed altars, the priests are the physiologists licensed to perform the unspeakable orgies of their blood-stained ritual.”—Mr. Wood, Lecturer to the National Society (1902).

7. “The day of drugging and scientific butchery is drawing to a close. Already the calm, reassuring

<sup>1</sup> Even the *Zoophilist*, which quotes this speech from the *Clapham Observer*, seems to feel that it might have been put more simply.

voice of the new Life Science, loud and clear to the few, is faintly audible to the many. The sharp, crucial knife, with its dangerous quiver so dear to the heart of the surgeon, the poisonous drug, will be things of the past. "Wisdom, thy paths are harmony and joy and peace."—*Journal of Zoophily* (1902).

---

Such is the frequent level of the *Zoophilist*, the official journal of the National Society, edited by Mr. Berdoo, controlled by Mr. Coleridge. Let us now take one more of that society's publications, a pamphlet entitled *Medical Opinions on Vivisection*. Here, if anywhere, should be the society's stronghold. If it could show a large and important minority of the medical profession opposed to all experiments on animals, its power would be greatly increased. On three occasions, many years ago, the medical profession did express its opinion. At two of the annual meetings of the British Medical Association, and at a meeting of the London International Medical Congress, resolutions were passed affirming the value and the necessity of these experiments. At one of these meetings there was one dissentient vote; at one, two; at one, none. These three meetings were truly representative; they were the great meetings of the clans of the profession, from all parts of the kingdom, for a week of practical work tempered by festivities. What more could any profession do than to go out of its way three times that it might record, in fullest assembly, its belief? And most certainly it would do the same thing again, if it thought that any further declaration were needed.

There are in this country about 40,000 medical men. The National Society's pamphlet quotes 39, or one in 1,000. It could quote more; but we must take what it gives us. Of these 39, we may fairly exclude Professor Koeh, Sir Frederick Treves, and the late Sir Andrew Clark, who would certainly wish to be thus excluded. Sir Frederick Treves,



who is quoted with a sort of explanatory note, has told us in the *Times* what he thinks of the way in which his name has been used ; Sir Andrew Clark is quoted, also with an explanatory note, for an *obiter dictum* ; and Professor Koch for no discoverable reason. That leaves 36. Of these 36, at least 11 (probably more) are dead ; one died about 1838, another was born in the eighteenth century, another died more than 20 years ago. Of the remaining 25, one is Dr. Lutaud, one is Mr. Berdoe, one an American doctor, not famous over here, one a veterinary surgeon, one (I think) opposed to vaccination, and three inclined to homœopathy ; one has achieved success on the London stage, one has mistranslated Harvey to the advantage of the National Society's cause, one has written *Hints to Mothers*, and one has written *How to Keep Well*. Of these 25 gentlemen, one belongs to a homœopathic hospital, two to provincial hospitals, and one to a hydro-pathic institute and a children's sanatorium ; the rest of them hold no hospital or school appointment of any sort or kind. I may be wrong over one or two of these names ; but, so far as I can see, I have given an exact account of the value of these *Medical Opinions on Vivisection*. And, if we take the dates of these opinions, we find one in 1830, one in 1858, and seven in 1870-1880. Anyhow, what is the value of an opinion that all experiments on animals are *arrant and horrible Sepoyism wearing the mask of Art and Science* ?

Let us leave the National Society, and turn to the Canine Defence League, and examine that part of its literature which is concerned with experiments on animals. Take the following sentences from pamphlets 179, 182, 184, and 204 :

“ Among the general public the majority are under the impression that these so-called physiological experiments are conducted under the influence of anæsthetics, and that the subjects are rendered insensible to pain ; this, however, is *not the case*, and

I am informed that a large proportion—considerably more than half—of the licenses dispense with anæsthetics entirely. The phenomena of pain are absolutely essential to any practical issue.”

“But, you say, these things are done on the Continent, not in England. Mr. Smith proves that animals are tortured in English laboratories without the use of any anæsthetic, curare being employed as a sham anæsthetic.”

“Kept rigid and motionless by curare, which paralyses movement, but greatly intensifies the agony, these bound and helpless victims of man’s pitiless cruelty are flayed alive, baked, boiled, burned, frozen, suffocated, dissected, hacked, and mutilated in every imaginable manner, subjected to every possible excruciating torture that scientific ingenuity can devise. . . . Let none be deceived by the idea, carefully fostered by the vivisectors, that anæsthetics safeguard the vivisected animals from suffering. No greater delusion ever misled a nation and sanctioned a national crime.”

“All diseases have a mental or spiritual origin. Upon this subject a large treatise might be written. I have carefully thought this matter over, and can come to no other conclusion. Can we imagine any wild bird confined to its nest with rheumatism, or neuralgia, or consumption, or asthma, or any other affection whatever? I believe them all to be entirely free from disease; that is, all which have retained their freedom, and thus have not come under the baneful influence of man. Take, again, the fishes, and ask whether any fisherman ever caught a fish found to be diseased. This subject is an interesting, though a somewhat melancholy one.”

Next, as an example of the literature of the London Society, let us take a speech made at St. James’s Hall, May 26th, 1903, by Dr. Hadwen, of Gloucester, who is also vehemently opposed to vaccination. He and Lieut.-General Phelps, at the time of the disastrous smallpox epidemic in Gloucester in 1896, were

leaders of the anti-vaccinationists. The London Anti-vivisection Society, in its latest report, says :

“Your committee are glad to announce the formation of a powerful new branch in Gloucester, altogether due to the efforts of our friend Dr. Hadwen and his influential supporters in that town, and your committee are happy to congratulate the society.”

It would be easy to give other instances of the sympathy between anti-vivisection and anti-vaccination. But our business is not with Dr. Hadwen at Gloucester, but with him at St. James's Hall. He says to the London Society :

“We are told we must pay attention to what the experts tell us. My opinion is this : If there is one person in the whole of God's creation that wants looking after, it is the expert. (Laughter.) . . . I say that everything we have learned so far, which is of any value whatever in the amelioration or cure of human disease, has never in one single instance that I know of been discovered by means of vivisection”

Of the House of Commons, he says :

“If there is one thing in the world that will move a member of Parliament, it is to know that any particular policy will carry votes along with it. (Hear, hear.) You can bring any member of Parliament to your knees as long as you show him that he has his constituency at his back ; and with all due respect to our noble chairman, I am bound to say that my experience of members of Parliament is this—that their consciences go as far as votes, and do not extend very much farther.” (Laughter and applause.)

He describes an imaginary experiment under curare, and is interrupted by a cry of “Demons !” He goes on :

“Yes, madam, they are demons. (Applause.) I know no other word to describe experimenters who can submit sentient and sensitive creatures, almost human in intelligence and faith, to diabolical experiments whilst their victims are rendered helpless and voiceless by a hellish drug. (Applause.) I cannot

understand how in a land like this, that boasts of her Christianity and of her liberty, men, women, clergy, and politicians can allow this cowardly science to stand before us, and this demoniacal work to be carried on." (Loud cheers.)

---

We have now seen something of the style of the literature of these Societies; and, in the next chapter, we will consider its arguments. I do not deny that its style is sometimes at a higher level than the examples which I have quoted. But I do say that I could fill a book of 100 pages with quotations from journals or pamphlets of the last few years, all of them on the lower level. And in this chapter I have practically quoted nobody but those who are the leaders of the opposition to all experiments on animals. The official journal of this Society, the annual report of that Society, the leaflets which are sent in answer to a formal request for literature—I have quoted these, as they came to hand, just going through them and marking those passages which were to my purpose.

---

### *III.—ARGUMENTS.*

WE have seen that the societies arose out of the Act, and not the Act out of them; that they are divided in policy; and that they have next to nothing to show for all the work of the last quarter of a century. Also we have noted the style of literature which they send broadcast over the country; and the "medical journals" and "medical opinions" that are in favour of the cause; and the general tone and frequent level of the official journal of the National Society. Still, a good cause may be ill-served; nobody minds, after all, the style of a thing,

so long as it is true. Let us come to the heart of the matter. What is the nature of the arguments and evidences of these societies? They desire to bring about the absolute prohibition, as a criminal offence, of all experiments on animals. By what facts, what records, what statistics, do they maintain this attempt to mend or end the present Act?

Here, at the risk of repetition, let us make quite clear what they are fighting against. Six out of seven experiments are bacteriological. That is to say, 85 per cent. Of these inoculations, more than 50 per cent. are made in the direct service of the national health, and as it were by the direct orders of Government. A vast number of them are wholly painless; nothing happens; the result is negative; the thing does not take. Some are followed by disease, and the animal is painlessly killed at the first manifestation of the disease, or recovers, or dies of the disease. The fate of that animal is the fate of all of us; it has got to die of something, and it dies of it. Anyhow, the talk about torture-troughs and cutting-up has no place here; and the word vivisection, by a gross and palpable exaggeration, is false six times out of every seven. Of the remaining 15 per cent. of all experiments; in those that are made under the License alone, or under the License *plus* Certificate C, the question of pain does not arise. The animal is anæsthetized, and is killed under that anæsthetic. The remaining 7 per cent. of all experiments are those that are made under the License *plus* Certificate B (or B+EE, or B+F). The initial operation is done under the anæsthetic; the animal is allowed to recover; it may be, practically, none the worse for it. Or it may be the worse for it, and therefore die, or be killed. But Certificate B is *not* allowed for any infliction of pain on the animal through the operation wound, and never will be.

Here are two sets of experiments: those under Certificate A, and those under Certificate B. One is 85 per cent. of all experiments; the other is



7 per cent. Six out of seven experiments are inoculations, and the operation of the seventh is done under an anæsthetic. That is the first fact, which we must fix in our minds, before we consider the arguments of the societies.

Next, the dates and the sources of their evidence. They wish to stop the experiments that are now made in this country. They are bound, therefore, to produce "up-to-date" evidence, and from home sources; not that which is thirty years old, or comes from sources a thousand miles away. This present use of animals, here and now, under the restrictions of the Act, is what they are fighting; they are bound to draw their instances from here and now.

But this would not suit them at all: they could not bear to be thus limited to here and now. Their arguments and their instances extend over thirty or more years, and are drawn from all parts of the world, from the United Kingdom, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, from every country. Journals of Physiology, text-books, reports, medical journals, British and foreign, are ransacked to find evidence for the cause; there is a regular system, year in year out, a sort of secret service or detective force, a persistent hunting-up of all scraps and shreds of evidence. One society lately advertised, in a daily paper, that it wanted confidential communications, from medical students, as to the practices of the laboratory. Another, seeing the chance of a prosecution, says, "Special inquiries were made on the subject, and the society's solicitor went to Belfast to conduct these inquiries on the spot." (Later, this society welcomed the authors of the *Shambles of Science*, approved their methods, made them honorary members.) All this espionage-business is sure now and again, in thirty years, to detect something which it can magnify into a scandal. And when a fault is found, even a little one, Oh the joy in the ranks of the societies. And, at once, the fault, exaggerated, and highly coloured, is made a



*locus classicus*, a commonplace of every drawing-room meeting. What is the date of it, what was the place of it? Was it long ago, was it far from here? Still, never let it drop; what one did then, they are all doing now, all of them of malice prepense; let us proclaim the blessed news from every platform; and please remember us in your Wills.

Among the arguments against all experiments on animals, is this very common argument, that the truth about them is too horrible to be told. "We dare not produce our brief," says the Rev. Nevison Loraine, at the annual meeting of the London Society in 1901: "it is only the courage of a lady that dares to produce tales so harrowing as those that have been briefly alluded to to-day; and it is part of the weakness of our cause with the public that we cannot tell the whole story." But, last November, the courage of two ladies, officers of a Swedish Anti-vivisection Society, honorary members of Mr. Coleridge's society, did produce a book full of harrowing tales; they told the whole story to the Lord Chief Justice and a jury. Was not that producing their brief? *I have here in my pocket something I have not got the nerve to read to you*, says Archdeacon Wilberforce, at the annual meeting of the National Society in 1901; and the next minute a lady in the audience is crying out *Do not go on, we cannot bear it*; and he says *You have got to bear it. Good God, they have got to suffer it*. Is not that producing his brief? Mr. Coleridge, in 1902, sends out 12,000 copies, just to begin with, of an illustrated German catalogue of laboratory instruments: *The question of thus scattering abroad this fearful document, has been the subject of very grave consideration. . . . We have launched upon the world this terrible proof of what vivisection really is, with a full sense of our responsibility*. Is not that producing his brief? These things in the pocket, and fearful documents, and briefs that Mr. Loraine dares not produce, are apt to say little or nothing about anæsthetics, and to be silent over the fact that

six out of every seven experiments are bacteriological, and to over-emphasise experiments made many years ago or a thousand miles away. You bring the speaker down to now and here, to the text of the Act, to the reports to Government, to the Home Secretary's own words in Parliament ; and you are told that they are all in a conspiracy, all liars more or less, and that the truth is in the societies, especially in one of them. Or you bring him down to the good that these experiments have done, the lives that they have saved ; and at once he is off like the wind :—

“ The society does not concern itself with the results of vivisection, whether good or bad, and thinks it is beside the mark to discuss them.” Report of the Canine Defence League, 1903.

“ When the angel of pity is driven from the heart : when the fountain of tears is dry, the soul becomes a serpent crawling in the dust of the desert.” Colonel Ingersoll.

“ I make no pretence to criticise vivisectional experiments on the ground of their technical failure or success. I dogmatically postulate humaneness as a condition of worthy personal character.” Mr. Bernard Shaw.

“ The vivisector, when he stands over his animal, whether with anæsthetics or without anæsthetics, is creating, even if the physical health of the nation is enhanced by it, a moral shroud not only for himself, but a moral shroud the edges of which are continually extending into the thought atmosphere, and so deadening the national conscience at large.” Mr. Herbert Burrows.

“ The developed taste for blood and cruelty must in the end find its full satisfaction in the vivisection of human beings when they have the misfortune to come under the power of our future doctors.” Bishop Bagshawe.

Here, in these five sentences taken merely out of the heap, is the ethical argument ; so facile, so pleasant to self, so confident of a good hearing. No

wonder that the societies, now that the facts of science are too strong for them, are falling back on the facts of ethics. In the beginning, thirty years ago, they were created out of ethics; they were born auspiciously. What a welcome they had! Tennyson and Browning and Ruskin, Westcott and Martineau, the late Lord Shaftesbury, and Her Majesty the late Queen—these all, and many more, among whom were some of the best men and women of the Victorian Age, were their friends. There never was a cause that enjoyed a better send-off. Everything was in its favour. Magendie and Schiff and Mantegazza had made people sick of experiments on animals. The advocates of the method had not very much to show on its behalf; no bacteriology, save as a far-off vision; no great discoveries lately in physiology or pathology. Thirty years ago, good and true men fought a way for the Act; and there are few now who think the worse of them for it, or grudge them that victory. But, though ethics may be the same always, yet the arguments from them are not. The ethical argument now—we try to find it, and it takes all shapes, and vanishes in a cloud of foul language. That text about the sparrows, which is never quoted in full; that fear about the vivisection of hospital patients; and all that nonsense about moral shrouds, and serpents in the desert, and developed tastes for blood; and Mr. Bernard Shaw, who on May 22nd, 1900, suggests to the National Society that "*the laceration of living flesh quickens the blood of the vivisector as the blood of the hunter, the debauchee, or the beast of prey is undoubtedly quickened in such ways*,"<sup>1</sup> and a week later, before the London Society, dogmatically postulates humaneness as a condition of worthy personal character; and the lady who says, *Oh, Pharisees and hypocrites! Oh, cruel and ruthless egotists!* and the Falstaff's army of the osteopath,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. R. B. Cunninghame-Graham's variant on this theme, in the *Daily News*, August 27, 1903, is really too bad to be put here. Like Mr. Loraine, I dare not produce my brief.

and the fruitarian, and the *anti* this, that, and the other, who follow the cause ; and all these discordant societies, and the appeals for money—where, in all this confusion, can we find the ethical argument ? Mercy is admirable, but I will wait till mercy and truth are met together. Let us leave the societies to their ethics, and see what they have to say for themselves in the lower realms of mere science. And, to avoid confusion and repetition, let us tabulate these arguments, not attempting to take all of them, or to take many at one time. Some of them are general ; some of them are special, and are concerned either with the experiments themselves, or with the administration of the Act.

1.

First, there are the general arguments. That experiments on animals are useless, or of very little use ; that they contradict each other ; that you cannot argue from animals to men, or from an animal under experiment to a man not under experiment ; that the discoveries made by the help of experiments on animals might have been made as well, or better, without that help ; that the way to advance medicine and surgery has been, and is, and always will be, not by experiments on animals, but by clinical and *post-mortem* studies. These and the like arguments we may call general ; they are the complement of the horrible stories and magic-lantern slides of the itinerant lecturer.

1. The vague statement that these experiments are of little use, may be answered in several ways. It does not come well from those who say that the question is ethical, not utilitarian ; who neither know, nor care, nor are agreed, what is the real value of these experiments. "I challenge you," says one, "to show me what good they have done." Another says, "I admit that they may perhaps have done a little good ; but so little ; they are a bad investment ; you would get a better return from other methods of

work." Another says, "I don't care whether they have or have not done good ; this is a matter of conscience ; we must not do evil that good may come ; I grant all, or nearly all, your instances—malaria, and diphtheria, and cerebral localisation, and so forth ; but the question is a moral question, and we must not inflict pain on animals, save for their own good." Probably the best answer is, that good has indeed come, and is coming, and so far as we can see will come, out of these experiments ; that the instances given are indeed true ; that these results were won out of many failures, and contradictions, and fallacies, and harkings-back ; and that they have stood the test of time, and will underlie all better results, all surer methods, that shall take their place.

Again, it is not the business of every experiment to discover a cure for some human ailment ; these "medical sciences" cast in their lot with the other natural sciences ; the results and half-results of many sciences are put together, added or multiplied or woven or grafted together—we want a dozen metaphors—and the net gain to practical medicine comes from here and there, from all sorts of sources and with all kinds of surprises, as the resultant of a blend of heterogeneous results ; sometimes as a bit of luck, sometimes as a deduction more fortunate than most, sometimes as an inspiration. Anyhow, it comes ; and, in the long run, the net gain to practice is in direct proportion to the zeal of the medical sciences.

2. The statement that "you cannot argue from animals to man" is not true. Why should it be ? Take tubercle, tetanus, or rabies. The tubercle-bacillus is the same thing in a man, a test-tube, or a guinea pig ; the virus of rabies is transmitted from dogs to men ; oysters harbour typhoid, fleas carry the plague, diverse mosquitoes carry malaria, yellow fever, filariasis, and dengue. Take the circulation of the blood, the nature and action of the motor centres of the brain, the vaso-motor nerves, the excretory organs, the contractility of muscle, the blood-changes



in respiration—where are the differences to support this statement that you cannot argue from animals to men? They say you cannot argue from animals to men, because pigeons are not susceptible to opium, and so forth; or because the torture of a dog would disturb its temperature. The many physiologists who are at present torturing dogs and keeping pigeons under opium must be careful. But what shall be said of the incessant use, year in year out, of this foolish argument?

3. The twin statements, that all the results got by the help of experiments might have been got some other way, and that clinical study and *post-mortem* study are infinitely more fruitful than experimental study, may be taken together. We are told that anybody could have discovered the circulation by injecting the vessels of a dead body. Well, Malpighi tried to discover the capillaries by this method, and failed. We are asked to admit that phrenology, long before physiology, discovered the truth about the surface of the brain; *I have been told*, says Mr. Coleridge at an annual meeting of his society, *that the physiologists can now triumphantly map out the human brain. I think the phrenologists have always been able to do that, and whether they or the vivisectors do it best does not much matter.* We are told that the use of thyroid extract could have been discovered right away, by mere chemistry and thinking. We hear of a proposal for a bacteriological laboratory on anti-vivisectionist principles, where no inoculations shall be made. This argument, that the whole thing might have been done some other way, must repair its wit, and find better instances. Then comes the incessant appeal: “Stick to clinical work; study diseases at the bedside, in the *post-mortem* room, in the museum, anywhere but in the laboratory. The Hospital taught you to neglect these methods; it made experiments on its patients, it cheated the public, it sheltered malignant cruelty in its most repulsive form under illustrious patronage. Set



aside its teaching; only sit by your patients long enough; that is the way of discovery."

Or the appeal takes another tone: "Stick to sanitation. If only everybody were healthy, everybody would be well. Diseases are due to dirt, to vice, to overcrowding, to want of common sense. Abolish all slums, disinfect all mankind, body and soul, make every house clean and wholesome, no bad drainage, or ventilation, or water, or food. Leave your torture-chambers and your megaloblasted guinea-pigs, and open your eyes to the blessed truth that, if everybody were healthy, and everybody were good, everybody would be healthy." What is the use of talking in this way? Suppose that all the physiologists suddenly rushed into practice, and all the bacteriologists were turned into medical officers of health. What would be gained? What difference would it make? The physiologists, of course, would merely vivisect their hospital patients; and the bacteriologists would hardly feel the change, for many of them are medical officers of health already, public servants, appointed by the State.

This argument, that practice is fruitful of discoveries, and science is barren of them, reaches its highest absurdity in the National Society's official journal; which praises extravagantly those methods of practice which were not discovered by the help of experiments on animals; praises them without experience, criticism, or understanding. It finds a statement, in the Medical Annual, that a year has passed without any great improvement in practice; and at once it lays the blame not on practice but on science. It fights hard against a fact which began in science, though it has been proved a thousand times over in practice. It accuses the bacteriologists now of caring nothing for human suffering, now of rushing after every new method of treatment and flooding the market with drugs. *There is money in the business*—that is the phrase of the *Zoophilist*. But there is money, also, in the anti-vivisection business. If

*you can provide for the society's future in your will, may we beg of you to do so? If you agree, pray do it now,* says the London Society: *this is the most alive humane organisation in the world.* But the National Society says, *A grave injury is done to the cause of mercy by the deplorable waste of money spent in perfectly unnecessary offices and salaries. We say that one office would amply suffice for all the work, and that one office would not need half-a-dozen paid secretaries.*

## 2.

Let us leave the general arguments and come to the special arguments. Some of them are concerned with the experiments themselves, some with the men who made them, some with the administration of the Act. These special arguments must be arranged in some sort of order; but they cross and recross, and are of diverse natures, and any attempt at strict arrangement would fail. That the arrangement may be useful for immediate reference, and may help anybody to answer statements made at debates and lectures, a separate heading has been given to each argument. Those arguments are put first which are concerned with the experiments themselves, or with the men who made them; afterward come those which are concerned with the administration of the Act. Some of these special arguments have lately been set forth by Mr. Berdoo, of the National Society, in two books, *A Catechism of Vivisection*, and *Broken Gods*. The latter book has an introduction by Mr. Coleridge, who speaks of the *selfish claims and squat materialism of these delvers into living dogs*, and hopes that Mr. Berdoo will dissipate and confute them. Let us examine some of the special arguments which are used, either in these two books or elsewhere, against experiments on animals.

## HARVEY.

"It is perfectly true," says Mr. Berdoo, "that Harvey again and again, in the plainest terms, de-

clares that his experiments on living animals aided him in his discoveries." We agree here with Mr. Berdoe. Then comes this sentence : *But that is not so important as it appears to be.* Why not ? What is gained by this attempt to explain Harvey away ? Dr. Bowie mistranslates him ; Dr. Abiathar Wall half-quotes him ; Mr. Adams says that Harvey did not ascribe his discoveries to experiments on animals ; Mr. Berdoe says that he did ; and Mr. Berdoe's society withdraws every pamphlet that involves acceptance of Dr. Bowie's mistranslation. Let us look at the headings of Harvey's own book, Chapters II, III, IV :

*Ex vivorum dissectione, qualis fit cordis motus.*  
*Arteriarum motus qualis, ex vivorum dissectione.*  
*Motus cordis et auricularum qualis, ex vivorum dissectione."*

Then read the Preface, and Chapter VIII. Why should we take, on Harvey's work, any opinion but that of Harvey ?

SIR CHARLES BELL.

"It is disgraceful of the vivisectors," says Mr. Berdoe, "to traduce the memory of this great surgeon ; but it shows that they will stick at nothing rather than concede his axiom that 'experiments have never been the means of discovery.' " Certainly, in the natural sciences, we have a right to stick at nothing rather than *concede an axiom* which is more than seventy years old. But the National Society still claims this axiom as a "medical opinion on vivisection ;" and would have men take, to-day, an estimate that was made long before anæsthetics, long before bacteriology. Anyhow, does this axiom apply to Bell's own work ? Were experiments the means of his discovery ? Late in life, he wrote against the "opening of living animals ;" it is no great wonder. But what does he write, in early life, of his own experiments, when they were still new in his mind ? Does he say that he reasoned out his discovery with-

out them, and then made them just to demonstrate his discovery? Even if that were so, the National Society would not gain much. But it is not so. His experiments were the means of his discovery; he said that they were, said it in words that cannot be explained away, any more than Harvey's words can be explained away. Take his pamphlet, printed in 1811, *An Idea of a New Anatomy of the Brain, submitted for the Observation of the Author's Friends*. What more could he have said? Could any man of science, Tyndall or Edison or Darwin or Newton, put in plainer words his debt to the experimental method? *I have found it*, says Archimedes of his experiment. *Like Archimedes, I have found it, I say*; that is what Asellius says of his experiment. *I now saw*, says Bell of his experiment. Where is the difference between them? Why does Mr. Berdoo, when attention is called to Bell's own words, say that it is disgraceful to traduce the memory of that great surgeon?

#### CEREBRAL LOCALISATION.

We have seen that Mr. Coleridge, at a great meeting in St. James's Hall, in 1902, said that he thought the phrenologists had always been able to map out the human brain, and that it did not much matter whether they or the vivisectors did it best. But these words should not be taken too seriously. Neither ought we to be too serious over his application to the Queen's Square Hospital, "to be favoured with the death-rate after operations since 1886, together with the names of the operating surgeons." (His deductions, when the Registrar-General does favour him with the death-rate, will be noted under a separate heading.) Mr. Berdoo says that it is "pure nonsense" to argue from the motor areas of a monkey's brain to those of a man's brain. Why is it nonsense? What is the difference between the movement of a group of muscles in a monkey's arm and the same movement of the same group of muscles in a man's arm? With



a very weak current, so weak that it is not diffused beyond the area where it is applied, the surface of a monkey's brain is stimulated at one spot ; and forthwith its opposite arm is flexed, or its opposite leg is drawn up, or whatever the movement may be, according to the spot. A man has some disease, acute or chronic, of his brain ; and, as the disease advances, twitchings occur in one arm or one leg, little irrational useless movements, or rigidity, or loss of power, according to the case. Is it pure nonsense to believe that the disease has reached a certain spot on the surface of his brain ? There is no question here of the mental differences between men and monkeys ; no question of consciousness or of will. But Dr. Holländer, who thinks very highly of Gall's system of phrenology, says, *Is the laboratory-man, the experimental physiologist, to teach us the mental functions of the brain from his experiments on frogs, pigeons, rabbits, dogs, cats, and monkeys ?* That is the argument ; that we must not compare the monkey's motor areas with the man's motor areas, for we cannot find the mind of a man in the brain of a frog.

But, putting aside phrenology, which is a broken reed for anti-vivisection to lean on, what other arguments are urged against the facts of cerebral localisation ? First, that the speech-centres were discovered without the help of experiments on animals. That is true ; and there, practically, the work of discovery stopped, till experiments on animals were made. Next, that the physiologists have not always been agreed as to the facts of cerebral localisation ; that Charcot doubted them, that Goltz criticised Munk, and so on. What is the date of these doubts and criticisms ? They are twenty years old. Next, that the surgery of the brain often fails to save life. That is true ; and the anti-vivisection societies make frequent use of this fact. But they are unable to suggest any better method. Mr. Berdoe tells us that he cannot remember hearing, in his student days, anything about brain experiments on animals :—

“ Our work was to observe as closely as possible the symptoms and physical signs exhibited by patients in the hospital wards who suffered from any form of nerve or brain disease, and having carefully noted them in our case-books, to avail ourselves, when the patient died, of any opportunity that was offered us in the *post-mortem* of correcting our diagnosis.”

That is an exact picture of the state of things 30 years ago ; the student taking notes, waiting for the *post-mortem* examination, then correcting his notes there, etc. Every case of brain-tumour in those days died, but some are saved now ; and every case of brain abscess in those days died (one was saved by a sort of miracle of surgical audacity) ; but many are saved now.

#### ANTITOXINS AND CARBOLIC ACID.

It is said by opponents of experiments on animals, that the active principle, in antitoxin, is not the antitoxin, but the carbolic acid which is added to it. They take this statement from the *Medical Brief*; and we have learned something of the style of that journal. Here is a sentence from the official journal of the National Society :—

“ The *Medical Brief* calls antitoxin ‘ the fraud of the age,’ and says : *Would that physicians could all realise the hideous horror of using this nasty stuff as a remedial agent.* It would be nothing less than ghouliness to inject the matter from an abscess into a child’s arm, yet antitoxin is not much better ; it is the decomposing fluid from a diseased horse, partially neutralised by carbolic acid.”

For a commentary on this sentence, take the following letter, from an eminent bacteriologist :—

“ Of course I am delighted to be able to give you the information required ; although I don’t suppose *anything* short of a miracle would convince an anti-vivisectionist ! As regards diphtheria antitoxin, the addition of an antiseptic is by no means necessary



or universal. For fully two years I added none to the serum which I prepared, but contented myself with filtration through a Kieselguhr filter, and bottling under aseptic conditions. At one time Roux used to put a small piece of camphor in each bottle as some sort of safeguard against putrefaction. Nowadays I believe that most makers preserve their sera by adding a trace of trikresol—I am not quite sure of the amount, but it is either '04 per cent. or '004 per cent. !”

But it is probable that the official journal of Mr. Coleridge's society will still accept the authority of the *Medical Brief*. Baccelli got good results, in tetanus, from the administration of carbolic acid; therefore, in diphtheria, the good results from diphtheria-antitoxin are due to the carbolic acid in it. That is the argument. But there is no carbolic acid in it? Oh, then the patient got well of himself, the treatment didn't kill him, it was not diphtheria after all, the disease has altered its type lately, he was well nursed, the back of his throat was painted with something, the doctor got half-a-crown by calling it diphtheria, the bacillus diphtheriæ may be found in healthy mouths, and all bacteriology is *base and blatant materialism*.

#### THE ARGUMENT FROM THE DEATH-RATE.

There is another argument against diphtheria-antitoxin; we may call it, for brevity, the death-rate argument. It is this. *The doctors say that the antitoxin does save lives; they give us statistics from every part of the world. But, if it saves lives, then the total mortality ought to go down. But the Registrar-General's returns do not go down; indeed, they tend to go up. Therefore diphtheria-antitoxin is useless, or worse than useless.* Despite the absurdity of this argument, Mr. Coleridge and Mr. Somerville Wood, the National Society's lecturer, have worked hard with it; Mr. Coleridge in the press, Mr. Wood on the platform.

Surely this confusion between the total mortality and the case-mortality of an epidemic disease is a very serious offence. That there may be no doubt of the confusion, let us consider a set of quotations, out of a correspondence published in September-October 1902, between G. P., whose initials we may take to mean general practitioner, and Mr. Somerville Wood. This correspondence is a good instance of the argument in its usual form.

G. P. : "The antitoxin treatment of diphtheria has lessened the mortality from that disease by nearly 50 per cent. In the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board the average case mortality for the last five years of the pre-antitoxin period, *i.e.*, previous to 1895, was 30·6; that for 1895 and the successive four years was 18·1, the successive figures being 22·8, 21·2, 17·7, 15·4, and 13·6, the mortality steadily falling with increased familiarity with the use of the remedy. This has not been the result of a diminished virulence of the disease, as similar experience has been gained all over the world. The figures for Chicago are even more striking, as the averages are 35·0 and 6·79 for the pre- and the post-antitoxin periods respectively."

Mr. Wood : "Nowadays, almost every sore throat is called diphtheritic, antitoxin is given, and wonderful statistics are formulated to bolster up the latest medical craze. The real test is whether the introduction of antitoxin has lowered the death-rate generally from diphtheria. Here are the Registrar-General's figures : In 1887, the death-rate from diphtheria per million persons in this country was 140. In 1897, after the treatment had been used several years, the death-rate from this disease increased to 246 per million."

G. P. : "Mr. Wood's statistics do not vitiate my argument in the very slightest. His selected figures, using the lowest rate since 1881, merely show that diphtheria as a whole was more prevalent in 1897 than in 1887. He cannot and does not attack the

statement that the case-mortality has been lessened where antitoxin has been used, and his test is no test at all."

Mr. Wood: "Let me give the annual death-rate from diphtheria to a million living persons from 1881 to 1900, taken from the Registrar-General's returns." (Gives them).

G. P. "One last word in answer to Mr. Wood. I repeat that his figures show nothing more than the accepted fact that diphtheria as a whole has been increasing for the last 30 years. This has no bearing at all on the also accepted fact that where antitoxin is used the mortality is lessened, and Mr. Wood has not, in fact, denied this. His confusion of total mortality and case-mortality only shows that he does not understand the elementary principles of statistics."

A few weeks later, at the *Bournbrook and Selly Oak Social Club*, Mr. Wood gives his "thrilling lecture, with lantern views," *Behind the Closed Doors of the Laboratory*: one of his stock lectures. In it, he says:—

"The proof of the pudding was in the eating. In 1881 the death-rate from diphtheria was 127 per million; in 1900 it was 290 per million. He had but to state that the antitoxin treatment was introduced about 1894."

Four days later, at an *overflowingly-attended Citizen Social* at Birkenhead:

"The proof of the pudding lay in the eating. In 1881 in each million of the population 121 persons died from diphtheria, while in 1900 the mortality from the same disease was 290 persons in each million of the population, and the antitoxin treatment was introduced in 1894."

A few weeks later, at Ipswich, the same thing. This time, he is challenged by letters in the *East Anglian Daily Times*, and he makes the following answer:

"My figures are from the Registrar-General's

returns. Here are his figures for the last 20 years. (Gives them). The figures Dr. Llewellyn Heath gives you are taken from the very restricted area of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and can be no refutation to figures based on the total death-rate per million for the whole of England and Wales."

A few weeks later, at the *Hyde Labour Church*: the *Closed Doors of the Laboratory* again:

"He found from the Registrar-General's returns that the death-rate had gone up in cases in which they were told that wonderful things had been done by experiments on living animals. If a lower death-rate could be shown, then the vivisectionists might have something to go upon; but they could not show a lower death-rate."

That was in January 1903. In December 1903, Mr. Wood is still using the same argument; this time it is a lecture at Ashton on *Vivisection and the Hospitals*:

"Again and again had they defied the so-called scientific world to put their finger on the Registrar-General's returns, and show them a single instance where the death-rate had been lowered by vivisection, and they had not been able to do it. On the contrary he found that the death-rate had gone up in the last 20 years, despite the thousands of animals that had been experimented upon. The death-rate in diphtheria was 100 per million more than it was in 1878."

Mr. Wood in the provinces, and Mr. Coleridge in the press, have used this argument hard, ever since the autumn of 1900. Let us look at it well. It has been refuted again and again. Take a thousand cases of diphtheria from any civilised part of the world, in the days before antitoxin; how many of them died? Take a thousand cases now, treated with antitoxin; how many of them die? Why do Mr. Wood and Mr. Coleridge run away from that easy question? There is nothing unfair in it; they have all the reports before them; they know the facts well. We do not find any evidence that they

are willing to acknowledge the truth of those facts. They refuse to face them; go off silently or with cheap idiotic jokes, and repeat, round the next corner, this nonsense about the Registrar-General. Follow Mr. Somerville Wood, from place to place, with his magic-lantern and his stock of lectures. The lantern-pictures are many of them taken from foreign sources, and some of them are of great age; but they include a portrait of Mr. Coleridge, and some comic slides to be shown at the end of the lecture, rabbits vivisectioning a professor, and so forth. Certainly, he works hard; 95 lectures in one year; *we cannot better employ the funds at our disposal than in sending well-informed lecturers to every city in the Kingdom to rouse the just indignation of the people.* The year after that, 74 lectures; *on two occasions he has spoken when unsupported to over 1,000 people, and an audience of several hundreds is quite the rule.* Here he is at Windsor, with Bishop Barry in the chair, and he says to them:—

“Unhappily, Pasteur left his microscope and chemicals and took up the vivisectionist’s knife. In that he got utterly astray and became nothing more than a mere quack.”

Here, with a different audience, at the Mechanics’ Lecture Hall, Nottingham, giving his lantern-lecture on *Pasteurism* to a *most respectable audience of working men, their wives, sons, and daughters, and in many cases children*:

“The thesis he set out to elaborate and maintain was that Pasteurism produces hydrophobia rather than cures it; that vivisection under any circumstances is both cruel and immoral; and that with special reference to bacterial toxicology and the treatment by inoculation, the preparation of toxins by the Pasteur methods was the most horrible form of repulsive quackery and hideous cruelty.”

Here he is at Birmingham, asking for money, and hinting that, unless all experiments on animals are stopped, *the poor will be the ultimate victims.* Here,



at Gloucester, saying that *it is silly to experiment at all*, and that he is not going to take his views as to right and wrong from any man of science, however learned he may be. Here, at Edinburgh, with the *Closed Doors* again, and the picture of the rabbit "roasted alive": three grains of opium, he tells them, would be enough to kill the strongest navvy in Edinburgh, but 16 grains can be administered to a pigeon; and the death-rate has gone up every year in spite of vivisection. Here, at a drawing-room meeting, asking for money; here, at a garden-party, with a *considerable number of persons ranging themselves on the grass*, and he tells them that they have on their side all that is best in every department of public life; here, a few weeks ago, at Blackburn, with the *Closed Doors* again, calling the law *a sham and a farce*; here, last of all, at Cheltenham, this year, with Bishop Mitehinson in the chair, still quoting the Registrar-General, and saying that *he does not think the outlook was ever more promising than it is to-day*. All over the kingdom, he and his magic-lantern, year after year, goes Mr. Wood. He is a fluent speaker; he has things in his pocket; they are brought out, if you contradict him; or he "challenges" you, or explains you away, or says that you "are not quite playing the game." Let him alone; to-morrow he will pack up his lantern, and be gone.

Mr. Coleridge, in his use of the death-rate argument, carries it even further than Mr. Wood; for he applies it over a wider range. "Look at myxœdema," he says: "The doctors tell us that they can cure it with thyroid extract, and that the use of thyroid extract was discovered by the help of experiments on animals. Very good. Myxœdema is due to some fault in the thyroid gland. Very good. But here are the Registrar-General's returns of the annual death-rate for all diseases of that gland. See, the death-rate has gone up, steadily, during the last 20 years." Was there ever such an argu-



ment? It is only of late years that myxœdema has been generally recognised. Till it was recognised, it was not diagnosed; till it was diagnosed, it was not returned as a cause of death. Again, there are many other diseases of the thyroid gland, including various forms of malignant disease. It is cancer of the thyroid gland that decides the death-rate. The number of deaths from myxœdema, especially since the discovery of thyroid extract, must be small indeed. Moreover, apart from Mr. Coleridge's fallacy of argument, it is impossible to see how he can really doubt the efficacy of the thyroid treatment, both in myxœdema and in sporadic cretinism.

Again, "Look at the diseases of the circulation," he says. "The doctors say that digitalis and nitrite of amyl act on the heart; and that the action of these drugs was discovered by the help of experiments on animals. Very good. The heart is concerned with the circulation. Very good. But here are the Registrar-General's returns of the annual death-rate for all diseases of the circulation. See, it has gone up, from 1,371 per million persons in 1881 to 1,709 in 1900. Therefore, either these two drugs are never used, or they are useless, or the Registrar-General's returns are false." It is impossible to understand how Mr. Coleridge could bring himself to write thus. Digitalis has a certain effect on the heart-beat; nitrite of amyl diminishes arterial tension. The Registrar-General's returns for all diseases of the circulation include every sort and kind of organic disease of the valves of the heart; include also pericarditis, aneurysm, senile gangrene, embolism, phlebitis, varicose veins, and 35,499 deaths from "other and undefined diseases of heart or circulatory system."

Still, Mr. Wood and Mr. Coleridge, during the last few years, have again and again used this argument from the death-rate, as though it were a help to their cause, and not a disgrace to it.

## RABIES.

For rabies, Mr. Berdoo praises the "Buisson Bath Treatment for the Prevention and Cure of Hydrophobia." The virtues of this treatment are proclaimed by the Chairman of the Canine Defence League, F. E. Pirkis, Esq. R.N., of Nutfield, Surrey, and it is founded, we are told, *on the simple common-sense principle that if poison is injected into a person's veins the best thing to do is to get it out as quickly as possible.* This sentence, and the reference to Mr. Pirkis for further particulars, and the fact that there is a Buisson Bath at the "National Anti-Vivisection Hospital," bring us to the question, What is the value of the evidence in favour of this treatment?

Mr. Berdoo, in his Catechism of Vivisection (1903) gives this evidence at considerable length. *The treatment, he says, is simplicity itself. It is merely the use of the vapour bath, which causes a free action of the skin to be set up, this draws the blood to the surface of the body, and so relieves the congestion of the internal organs.* Let us consider this sentence. (1): Suppose that X—— were bitten by a mad dog, say on March 1st, and on March 8th he took a course of Buisson Baths, for safety's sake. There would be no congestion, at that period, of his internal organs; what would be the good of drawing the blood to the surface of his body? Mr. Pirkis says that there would be poison in his veins; it would be a very subtle poison. How can Mr. Pirkis tell that it is all in his veins and none of it elsewhere? Again, X—— would be feeling perfectly well. How would a vapour-bath get this poison out of his veins? It could not do it by relieving the congestion of his internal organs, for they would not be congested. How would it do it? And how would Mr. Pirkis know when it had done it? (2): Suppose that X—— were bitten by a mad dog, and, in due time, were seized by hydrophobia. Has Mr. Pirkis ever seen a case of that disease—ever seen a case of hydrophobia?

Are they going to tie X—— down, or steam him under ehloroform, or what? And how many baths would he want? But there are eases; there is evidence; a “mass of cures in Asia.” Let us look at them; and let us divide them into eases of prevention and cases of cure. Let us take, first, the cases of cure.

There are five of these. Five, and no more. One is Dr. Buisson; cured by one bath, while he was trying to commit suicide; nothing said about the dog. One is a case at Kisehineff, near Odessa, 18 years ago; no evidence is given that the dog was rabid. One is a case at Arlington, New Jersey, 18 years ago; no evidence is given that the dog was rabid. One is the case of Pauline Kiehl; no date; no reference to say where the case is published; no account of her symptoms. And one is a case at the Jaffna Hospital, Ceylon; no date; and nothing said about the dog. Of these five cases, three were a boy, a lad, and a little girl; but their ages are not given. Five eases in 20 years; they hail from all parts of the world, France, Russia, the United States, Ceylon, and France again; three of them happened 18 years ago, or more. And, so far as they go, not one of them is genuine. Spurious hydrophobia, the simulation of the disease out of sheer terror of it, as in Dr. Buisson’s case, is well known.

Now we come to the eases of prevention. Over 80 of them, we are told; but seven are especially noted. Four in 1895, under the care of Dr. Ganguli of Dinajpur; two in 1896, under the care of Dr. Dass of Narainganj; and one in 1896, Mr. Kotwal of Bassein. Of this “mass of cures in Asia,” we all know what would have been said if Pasteur had been in charge of them; that the dogs were not rabid, that the bites were not infected, that the wonder is that the poor deluded victims were not added to Pasteur’s hecatomb.

Next, what does Mr. Berdoo say of the division of all patients at the Pasteur Institute into classes

A, B, and C? Does he admit that a dog is proved to have been rabid, if a minute portion of its nervous tissue, taken from it after death, and put into a rabbit, causes the rabbit to have paralytic rabies? No; there are still two things left for him to say:—

1. He says, on the authority of the *Veterinary Record* of eight years ago, that *the death of a rabbit with cerebral symptoms is not a positive indication of death from rabies.*

2. He says that Vulpian discovered that healthy human saliva was poisonous to rabbits, and that it contained a micro-organism which Pasteur had also found in the saliva of a rabid patient. What does this statement prove or disprove? It is 23 years old; but Mr. Somerville Wood, a few weeks ago, used it at a debating society, with great fervour.

Also Mr. Berdoo quotes the late M. Peter, Dr. Lutaud's forerunner; quotes an *obiter dictum* of Professor Billroth, but without any date; tells us that Pasteur himself, in a letter, referring to one particular case, declared cauterisation to be a sufficient preventive, but does not tell us the date of the letter, or the facts of the case; and quotes a death-rate, but stops at 1890. Of course, any method of treatment, if you ransack its records over a sufficient number of years, will show, now and again, failures or disasters. Take, for instance, those methods of light-treatment, which Mr. Berdoo praises so highly. They have had many failures, and one or two disasters. If they had been discovered by the help of experiments on animals, we might have had a pamphlet from the National Society, *The Roentgen "Cure"; its List of Victims.*

#### CERTIFICATE A AND CERTIFICATE B.

For the last three years, frequent use has been made of some words spoken by the Home Secretary in Parliament, on July 24th, 1899. He was asked whether he would state what rules were laid down with regard to the granting or signing of certificates



dispensing with the use of anæsthetics in experiments on animals ; and whether there was any limit to the number of such certificates which one person might sign, or to the number of experiments upon different animals which might be performed by the person holding one such certificate. There can be no doubt as to the meaning of these questions. Certificate A, which is granted only for inoculation experiments or similar proceedings, and never for any serious cutting operation, dispenses wholly with anæsthetics. Certificate B, which is granted for any kind of operation *plus* observation of the animal after operation, dispenses partly with anæsthetics ; that is to say, the operation is done under an anæsthetic, and the subsequent observation of the animal, which is counted as part of the experiment, is made without an anæsthetic. The questions come to this : When the Home Office grants Certificate A, or Certificate B, what precautions does it take against any abuse of these certificates, and what restrictions does it impose on them ?

The Home Secretary answered :

“ It is the practice of the Home Office, in addition to the fact that all certificates expire on December 31st of the year in which they are granted, to limit the number, and this is always done in the case of serious experiments in which the use of anæsthetics is wholly or partly dispensed with.”

The *Times* says that the Home Secretary said “ serious experiments.” Mr. Coleridge says that *Hansard* says that the Home Secretary said “ serious operations.” We need not doubt that Mr. Coleridge is right ; but we must doubt whether *Hansard* underlines the word *wholly*, as Mr. Coleridge does. Anyhow, it does not matter now whether the Home Secretary, five years ago, said *experiments* or *operations*. His meaning is clear enough ; that, in all serious procedures, whether they be under Certificate A or under Certificate B, a limit is put to the number of experiments. Which is the plain truth, as every-



body knows who is concerned in the administration of the Act; and the limit may be very strict indeed. After this statement by the Home Secretary in 1899, we still find Dr. Abiathar Wall, the Hon. Treasurer of the London Anti-vivisection Society, saying in 1900 that *a vivisector has only to say that he has a theory whereby he hopes to discover a cure for, say, neuralgia of the little finger, and the Home Secretary promptly arms him with a license to torture as diabolically as he pleases and as many animals as he deems fit.* And the National Society makes constant use of this phrase about “serious experiments”; declaring that the Home Secretary himself has said that animals are tortured under the Act. Here are three statements to that effect, made by the National Society’s Parliamentary Secretary, by its Lecturer, and by its Hon. Secretary:

1. (Annual Meeting, Queen’s Hall, May 1900).—“If you are still unconvinced—if anyone is not thoroughly satisfied that there is ample cause for the anti-vivisectionist movement to-day—it is only necessary for me to refer you to the words of the Home Secretary, as spoken in Parliament, in the year 1898.<sup>1</sup> He said: ‘There are serious operations which are performed, during which the use of anæsthetics is wholly or partially dispensed with.’ Could there be any more sweeping indictment than that? Is there any need for me to attempt to convince you that the lower animals are vivisected painfully, after the words officially spoken by the Home Secretary in the House of Commons?”

2. “If you want any further proof I will quote from Hansard, July 24th, 1899, when the then Home Secretary stated in the House of Commons that serious experiments take place under the law of England, in which the use of anæsthetics is wholly or partially dispensed with. Now I affirm that serious experiments in which anæsthetics are wholly or

<sup>1</sup> This should be 1899.

partially dispensed with mean torture pure and simple."

3. (Annual Meeting, St. James's Hall, May 1901).—"If this were not enough, the late Home Secretary has told us the facts. I have Hansard here. On July 24th, 1899, the late Home Secretary in his place in Parliament, and in his official capacity as Home Secretary, told us that 'serious experiments, in which the use of anæsthetics have been wholly or partially dispensed with,' do take place in English laboratories. We know, therefore, that torture does take place."

Each of the three speakers uses this phrase as a final and irresistible argument. *If you are still unconvinced. If you want any further proof. If this were not enough*—they all of them play the Home Secretary, as a sure card: at Queen's Hall, at St. James's Hall, they produce him as though it were indeed unanswerable, this phrase of his that is five years old. Since they are willing to go back so far, let us take them back a little further. This phrase about "serious experiments" was spoken on July 24th, 1899. On May 9th of that year, a question was put and answered in the House. It was put by the same gentleman who put the question in July; it was answered by the same Home Secretary; and it was practically the same question. The Home Secretary, in his answer, said:—

"The sole use of this Certificate (B) is to authorise the keeping alive of the animal, after the influence of the anæsthetic has passed off, for the purpose of observation and study. I should certainly not allow any certificate involving dissections or painful operations without the fresh use of anæsthetics."

Here, in May 1899, we have this emphatic statement, that Certificate B is *not* allowed for "serious operations without anæsthetics." Why did the National Society stop at July? If it had only gone a few weeks further back, a surprise was in store for it. But at July it stuck; thus it was still able to say all

sorts of things about "legalised torture." So late as May 6th, 1902, at the great annual meeting at St. James's Hall, the Rev. Reginald Talbot said :—

"Certificate B makes it necessary that the operator should produce complete anæsthesia during the initial operation, but (please mark this) after the initial operation is over, after the animal has returned to the state of semi or complete consciousness, there is then allowed by this certificate a period of observation upon a semi-sensible or completely sensible animal. The animal is opened, is disembowelled, and in that condition his vital organs can be probed and stimulated. Now that is something more than pain; it deserves something more than the name of even severe and prolonged pain. Surely this comes within the tract and region of what we may call agony."

As for Certificate A, the inoculations-certificate, which is used for inoculations only, and therefore is granted for six experiments out of every seven, he said :—

"There is a Certificate A, which, if it were granted, and when it is granted—and pray you mark my words, for I know what I am speaking about, and I want you to know too—would allow major operations to be performed upon animals, cats, dogs, or any other animals, without the use of any anæsthetic at all. I know quite well that that certificate has not been applied for, or has not been granted this last year, or, so far as I know, in any previous year, but I say this, that so long as it is possible under the law to take out such a certificate as that, as long as it is in the power of a Home Secretary to grant according to the law a certificate which would allow something more than agony and torture—I do not know any words in which to describe it—I say surely the case of the animals is in need of protection, and protection which this law does not afford."

It is impossible to understand these words. Certificate A is never granted for major operations. It is

never granted (save in conjunction with another certificate) for any sort or kind of experiment on a cat or a dog, or a horse, or an ass, or a mule. It is more in use than all the other certificates put together; it covers six experiments out of every seven. We shall try in vain to guess how this mistake arose in the speaker's mind. But, at the great annual meeting of the chief of all the anti-vivisection societies, it is strange indeed that nobody seems to have corrected him. This description of a certificate which does not exist—I *know what I am speaking about*, he says, *and I want you to know too*—was applauded by an audience that filled the whole Hall. Nobody on the platform put him right. And, in the next number of its official journal, the National Society reported every word of his speech, and said that he had *analysed the Act and its administration in a striking and powerful manner.*

#### CURARE.

“Curare,” says Mr. Berdoo, “paralyses the peripheral ends of motor nerves, even when given in very minute doses.” That is to say, it prevents all voluntary motion. Then comes this frank admission, “Large doses paralyse the vagus nerve and the ends of sensory nerves.” That is to say, it can be pushed, under artificial respiration, till it paralyses sensation. With small doses, the ends of the motor nerves lose touch with the voluntary muscles. With large doses, under artificial respiration, the ends of the sensory nerves lose touch with the brain. Let us agree with Mr. Berdoo that curare does act in this way; that it does not heighten sensation, and has no effect, save in very large doses, on sensation, and then abolishes sensation. Only, of course, to procure this anæsthetic effect, the animal may have to be subjected to artificial respiration.

(The evidence as to the action of curare on the

sensory nerves rests not on the ease of accidental poisoning recorded by Mr. White, though that case does point that way, but on Schiff's experiments on the local exclusion of the poison from one leg of the frog by ligature of an artery.)

This, surely, is a true definition of curare, that it is a painless poison, which in small doses prevents the transmission of motor impulses; and, in large doses, which may necessitate the use of artificial respiration, prevents the transmission of sensory impulses. Mr. Berdoo can hardly refuse to accept this definition; indeed, it is his own. And, certainly, he would be a bold man who said that a small dose of curare has any effect on sensation; or that the exact strength of any one specimen of curare is standardised as a supply of antitoxin is standardised.

Now we have a perfect right to take a practical view of curare. At the present time, and in our own country, how is it used? The Act forbids its use as an anæsthetic. What evidence does Mr. Berdoo bring that it is so used?

1. He quotes Professor Rutherford's experiments. These were made at least 14 or 15 years ago.

2. He quotes Dr. Porter's paper, "On the Results of Ligation of the Coronary Arteries." (*Journal of Physiology*, vol. xv. 1894, p. 121). Dr. Porter speaks of four experiments made under morphia *plus* curare. These experiments were made at Berlin, 12 years ago. Dr. Porter is Professor of Physiology at Harvard, U.S.A.

3. He refers to Professor Stewart's papers, in the same volume of the *Journal of Physiology*. The one experiment which he quotes at some length was made at Strasburg, 12 years ago or more.

But we want to know what is done now and here under the Act, not what was done at Berlin or Strasburg twelve or more years ago. Still, the experiments by Professor Stewart are in constant use, among the opponents of all experiments on animals. In May 1900, at the great annual meeting



of the National Society, at Queen's Hall, Dr. Reinhardt said :—

“ I will pass on to prove to you, by a few conclusive evidences, for which I can give you chapter and verse, that torture is inflicted on animals by British vivisectors to-day. Now, if you buy the 15th volume of the *Journal of Physiology*, and look at page 86, you will find there,” *etc.*

To prove that animals are tortured in England to-day, he quotes one experiment made at Strasburg eight years previously. And, in 1901, Mr. Coleridge wrote, in the *Morning Leader*, saying, *It is with curare, which paralyses motion and leaves sensation intact, that all the most shocking vivisections are performed.* And, the same year, Mr. Stephen Smith, a “ Medical Patron ” of the London Society, wrote, *I state emphatically that when curare is used, proper anæsthesia is out of the question. . . . Curare is used daily throughout England. Mention of an anæsthetic in a report is no guarantee that the animal was anæsthetised.*

I cannot find, in all the anti-vivisection literature which I have read, any shadow of evidence that any experiment of any sort or kind has been made in this country, on any sort or kind of animal, under curare alone, for the last 14 or 15 years. I believe that I might go further back than that. But surely that is far enough.

Certainly, so long as any curare is used (not as an anæsthetic, but in conjunction with an anæsthetic) in any experiments on animals in this country, the Societies will not trouble to inquire how much of it is used. I wrote, therefore, to the Professors of Physiology at Edinburgh, Cambridge, and Oxford, and asked them to tell me how much curare was used in their laboratories throughout 1903, and what anæsthetics were given with it. Some opponents of experiments on animals seem to think that curare is used very often. One of them says that it is “ in daily use throughout England.” So I wrote

to these Professors at our Universities, and they kindly sent the following answers :—

1. “Your question *re curare* is easily answered. We did *no* experiments with it during the past year. Indeed, I have given it up almost entirely for years, chiefly because it is very difficult to get a preparation which—I suppose from impurities—does not seriously affect the heart. There might still be occasions during which it is necessary to use it—if *e.g.* the *least* muscular movement would vitiate the results of an experiment. But I find it possible in nearly all cases to get such absolute quiescence with morphia or chloral (besides ether and chloroform) that to all intents and purposes I have long given up the use of curare. Of course, if I had occasion to use it, an anæsthetic would be administered at the same time.”

2. “I have asked those who worked in the physiological laboratories in 1903 to give me a return of the number of experiments done and of the number in which curare was used. Including my own experiments, I find that 160 in all were made under the License and Certificates B, EE, C. Curare was given in four cases: in two of these the A. C. E. mixture was the anæsthetic, in the other two ether.”

3. At the third laboratory, during 1903, curare was given to seven frogs made unconscious before it was given, and to one rabbit under ether.

That was the whole use of curare, during a whole year, in three great Universities: at one, seven decerebrate frogs, and one rabbit under ether: at another, four animals, under A. C. E. or ether: at another, nothing.

#### “INCOMPLETE ANÆSTHESIA.”

It sometimes happens, at an operation, that the patient moves. Mostly, this movement is at the moment of the first incision through the skin; but

it may be at some later period during the operation. He does not remember, after the operation, that he moved, or that he felt anything. That is incomplete anæsthesia, or light anæsthesia. The corneal reflex may be abolished, and still the patient may move.

Five years ago some experiments were made in this country by an American surgeon. In the published account of them, it was said that one of the animals was, at one time, under incomplete anæsthesia; and that, in the case of another animal, the anæsthesia was at one time overlooked. This latter phrase meant not that the anæsthetic had been left off, but that it had been given in excess, so that the blood pressure suddenly fell. The character of the experiments, and the occurrence of these two phrases about the anæsthesia, roused public opinion, and the Home Office instituted an inquiry into the matter. "That inquiry," it said, October 11th, 1899, "resulted in showing no evidence whatever that the animals experimented on by Dr. Crile felt pain. On the contrary, all the evidence shows they did not." The Act does not go into questions of corneal reflex, and unconscious muscular movements, and all the undefinable shades between incomplete anæsthesia and complete anæsthesia and profound anæsthesia. "The only substantial question," says the Home Office, "is whether or no the animal has been during the operation under the influence of an anæsthetic of sufficient power to prevent it feeling pain. This is the requirement of the law." We cannot refuse to call morphia and chloral anæsthetics; for there are deaths every year from an overdose of them. And we cannot admit that an animal under an anæsthetic, because it makes a movement, is in pain or is conscious; for we know that a patient under operation may move yet feel nothing. Every hospital surgeon, and every anæsthetist, who has seen a whole legion of patients go under chloroform or ether and come

out of it, and everybody who has been under these anæsthetics, they all know that incomplete anæsthesia is not "sham anæsthesia," and that movements, even purposive movements, may occur without consciousness, without pain, alike in men and in animals.

"ONE ANIMAL" AND "ONE EXPERIMENT."

When the Home Office allows a licensee to make a certain number of experiments, it means that he may experiment on that number of animals and no more. The Home Office, having heard what the experiments are to be, where they are to be made, on what kind of animals, and for what purpose, and having taken advice about them, allows him to make, let us say, 10, and adds any restrictions that it likes, *e.g.* that he must send in a preliminary report when he has made 5. And one thing is certain, that one experiment=one animal, and that 10 experiments=10 animals, and no more. Everybody knows that, who knows anything at all about the administration of the Act.

Now take a false statement, which has been made again and again during the last seven years, that one experiment=any number of animals: and observe how it spread.

1. In the House of Commons, on March 12th, 1897, Mr. MacNeill asked whether any record were kept of the number of animals used in experiments during 1895; and said that 200 or 300 animals are sometimes used in a single experiment, and that 80 or 90 is a common number. The Home Secretary answered, "The honourable member is under an entire misapprehension. The number of animals used does not exceed the number of experiments given in the return."

2. A year later, May 18th, 1898, at the Annual Meeting of the National Society, Mr. MacNeill said again, "Anyone casually reading that report would

imagine that each experiment was on the body of a single animal. It is nothing of the kind. An experiment is a series of investigations in some particular branch, and sometimes 20, 30, or 40 animals are sacrificed in the one experiment." The National Society published this speech in its official journal.

3. A few weeks later, an anonymous letter in the *Bradford Observer* said, "Anyone casually reading the report would imagine that each experiment was on the body of a single animal. It is nothing of the kind. An experiment is a series of investigations in some particular branch, and sometimes 20, 30, or 40 animals are sacrificed in the one experiment."

4. On August 1st, 1898, the National Society published this letter in its official journal, under the heading, *Our Cause in the Press*.

5. On October 21st, 1902, a letter in a provincial paper said that "one experiment" means "not one animal, but a series of operations on many animals."

6. In January 1903, the National Society admitted that its action in 1898 (see 4) was "unfortunate."

7. On June 25, 1903, in Parliament, Mr. MacNeill again said that "an experiment" did not mean one operation, but a series of researches, "often performed by persons who had no more skill than the children who broke up a watch."

8. About this time, the same false statement was made by an Anti-vivisection Society at Manchester.

9. A little later, it was made by the National Canine Defence League, in these words, "Each experiment may include any number of dogs. There is no limit fixed by law." On January 11, 1904, in the *Times*, the leaflet containing this and other "grossly false and misleading statements" was vehemently denounced by the National Society.

It would be hard to find a better instance of the spreading of a false report. An experiment? Oh, it is any number of animals—20 of them, 30 of them ;



200, 300 of them ; hecatombs, and triple hecatombs ; any young doctor can get leave to cut them up.

#### CERTIFICATES E AND EE.

For all inoculations and similar proceedings, Certificate A is necessary. For all experiments where the animal is allowed to recover from the anæsthetic, Certificate B is necessary. But these certificates do not extend to the dog, the cat, the horse, the mule, or the ass. The three latter animals are also scheduled under Certificate F ; the dog and the cat under Certificates E and EE. That is to say, to inoculate a dog, *e.g.* for the study of the preventive treatment against distemper, it is necessary to hold a License, *plus* Certificate A, *plus* Certificate E ; to operate on a dog, and let him recover, it is necessary to hold a License, *plus* Certificate B, *plus* Certificate EE.

Now let us compare the number of dogs and cats with the number of other animals used. Out of every seven experiments, six are inoculations or similar proceedings. That is to say, out of the total of 14,906 experiments made during 1902, 12,776 were inoculations or of the nature of inoculations. Of these 12,776, only 92, or 0·072 per cent., were made on dogs or cats, and only 54, or 0·042 per cent. were made on horses, asses, or mules.

Apart from all inoculations, 2,130 experiments were made on animals of all kinds. Of these 2,130 experiments, 1,185, or more than 50 per cent., were not under Certificate B ; the animal was anæsthetised, and was killed under the anæsthetic. The remaining 945 experiments were made under Certificate B, or Certificates B *plus* EE. Under B, 693 ; under B *plus* EE, 252 ; under B *plus* F, none.

Thus, the total number of dogs and cats, either inoculated, or allowed to recover after operation under anæsthesia, was 344 for the whole year, over the whole kingdom. In every other instance where

a dog or a cat was used, it was anæsthetised and killed under the anæsthetic.

And it is certain that the Home Office does enforce and emphasise here the spirit of the Act ; and that it does guard and restrict and tie up Certificate EE with its own hands.

Let us take a recent instance, which shows in a very clear light the methods of the National Canine Defence League. A few months ago, certain experiments were made on dogs, for the purpose of finding the best way of resuscitating persons apparently drowned. The Home Secretary was asked whether he knew that certain of these experiments were to be made without anæsthetics ; and he answered, " In view of the great importance of the subject in connection with the saving of human life, and of the strong recommendations received in support of the experiments, I have not felt justified in disallowing the certificates."

A great outcry was raised against these experiments by the National Anti-Vivisection Society and the Canine Defence League. The National Society, in its official journal, August 1903, said that it was now proved, " that in England to-day experiments are performed without anæsthetics which involve inconceivable agony to dogs, and this with the deliberate permission of the Home Secretary." Mr. Coleridge made a public appeal to all humane societies, to go down with all their strength into Kent, on that not far distant day when the Home Secretary would have to face his constituents, and turn him out of Parliament. The Canine Defence League sent two memorials to the Home Office, circulated a petition, and issued leaflets, entitled *A National Scandal*, *Scientific Torture*, *A Peep behind the Scenes*, and so forth. We must consider one of these leaflets at some length ; but first let us see what is the truth about these experiments. They were made by the Professor of Physiology at Edinburgh ; and he has kindly written to me about them. *In every experi-*

ment, except two, the animal was, throughout the whole experiment, under complete anæsthesia with chloroform or ether. In two cases, and in two only, a small preliminary operation, under anæsthesia, having been performed, the animal was allowed to recover from the anæsthetic, or almost to recover from it, and was then and there submerged and drowned, at once and completely, to death ; no attempt at resuscitation was made ; it became unconscious in a little more than a minute.

In the face of these facts, what is to be said of the outcry raised by the Canine Defence League ? They presented two memorials to the Home Secretary : they got up a monster petition with thousands of signatures ; and they issued the following leaflet :—

SIGN THE  
NATION'S PETITION  
TO PARLIAMENT AGAINST THE  
DISSECTION OF LIVE DOGS  
*In Medical Laboratories.*

1. Dogs, on account of their docility and obedience to the word of command, are the animals chiefly selected for torture.

2. Thousands of dogs are tortured yearly by licensed experimenters.

3. The total number of experiments performed in 1902 was 14,906, 12,776 of which were without anæsthetics.

4. The Home Secretary stated in Parliament on July 22nd, 1903, that neither the starving of animals to death nor the forced over-feeding of animals were included in these returns.

5. Nor does the number 14,906 give the number of dogs used, for each experiment may include any number of dogs—there is no limit fixed by law.

6. The Home Secretary stated in Parliament on May 11th, 1903, that at one laboratory alone in

London 232 dogs were used for vivisectional experiments last year.

7. There are now laboratories scattered over the whole of the United Kingdom.

8. The Home Secretary stated in Parliament on 10th July, 1903, that one dog may be used *again* and *again* for vivisectional experiment or demonstration—and this without anæsthetics.

Think of the condition of the poor dog between each living-dissection.

Has not the time come for the nation to rise as one man and say—

“ This shall not be ? ”

It is no wonder that even the National Anti-vivisection Society, in a letter to the *Times*, December 11th, 1903, denounced this leaflet. The wonder is, that Mr. Pirkis, R.N., the chairman of the Canine League, tried to defend it. *This deplorable leaflet*, said the National Society: *It contains a series of grossly false and misleading statements.* Let us take it paragraph by paragraph. The first two paragraphs are grossly false. The third suppresses the truth. The fourth is grossly false; the Home Secretary said that neither the starving of animals to death nor the forced over-feeding of animals was included among the experiments *authorised or performed*. The fifth paragraph is grossly false. The sixth and seventh, taken together, are misleading; the entire number of all dogs and cats together, used under Certificates A *plus* E, and B *plus* EE, throughout the whole of the kingdom, was 344. The eighth paragraph is grossly false.

---

For want of space, it is impossible to consider all the special arguments of the anti-vivisection societies. Of course, among these special arguments, there are a few which have something in them. How could they all of them be utterly false? They go back

over 30 years ; they are drawn from all parts of the world. This incessant rummaging of medical books and journals, British and foreign ; and all this everlasting espionage ; the whole elaborate system of a sort of secret service—these methods, year in year out, are bound to find, now and again, a fault somewhere. But I do say, having read and re-read a vast quantity of the publications of these societies, that they are, taken as a whole, a standing disgrace to the cause ; that they are tainted through and through with brutal language, imbecile jokes, and infinite self-assurance ; that they have neither the candour, nor the common decency, which should justify them. As a literature, they stand alone : there is nothing like them, unless it be the literature of the worst anti-vaccinationists. Still, here it is that the money goes. There is *money in the business* ; there is *milk in the cocoa-nut* ; and *twopence more, and up goes the donkey*. These are the phrases used by the National Anti-Vivisection Society, of the bacteriologists, and the men who are working at cancer. But these societies, that spend thousands every year, what have they got to show for it all ? They have, with much else of the same kind, the *Zoophilist*. Truly, a fine result ; a high-class official journal, the *recognised organ of the anti-vivisection movement in England*.

It is a good rule, for anybody who has to face, in debate or in correspondence, one of these special arguments urged by a member of this or that society, to ask what evidence is in favour of it. What is the date, what is the source, of that evidence ? What is the context of this or that quotation ? What did the authority, thus quoted, say a few months earlier, or a few pages later ? What is his real value as a witness ? What is his country ? Is he alive or dead ? If dead, when did he die ? If alive, is he an expert, is he free from prejudice, is he really any authority at all ? By these and the like tests, every such argument must be tried.



Take, for a final instance, one or two of the things said about anæsthetics. On June 12th, 1897, in the *Echo*, Mr. Berdoo said that certain experiments, involving severe operations, had been made on dogs under morphia and curare. He based this assertion on the account of the experiments in the *Journal of Physiology*. On June 18th, Mr. Weir, in the House of Commons, called attention to this assertion; and the Home Secretary promised to inquire into the matter. On July 18th, Mr. Weir asked whether this inquiry had been made; and the Home Secretary answered:

“Yes, I have made full inquiry into the allegations contained in the letter and statement which the honourable member forwarded to me, and find that they are absolutely baseless. The experiments referred to were performed on animals under full chloroform anæsthesia; the morphia, to which alone allusion was made in the published account of the experiments, being used in addition. Curare was used, but not as an anæsthetic.”

It is simple enough. The gentlemen who made the experiments did not know that the National Society buys and ransacks the *Journal of Physiology*; or did not care. But the National Society called this answer a “Fruitless Official Denial;” and Mr. Coleridge sent an “explanatory letter” to the London daily papers, accusing all the experimenters of “amending their published record so as to make it fit in with the Government report.” In 1899, the National Society published that sentence, which has already been quoted, about the *Nine Circles*, and the “whiff of chloroform possibly administered.” In 1900, it said “The chloroformists of the physiological laboratories are doubtless common porters, with no technical knowledge of their work.” In 1901, it said, “Our readers will remember that Mr. Coleridge has had more than one battle with the Home Office on the question of complete and incomplete anæsthesia.

We need hardly say that the victory on each occasion rested with our Honorary Secretary." And again, "By many turns of the anti-vivisection screw we have at last extracted (from the Home Office) the admission that pain is not unknown in the laboratories." And again, "Our readers will have noticed that he (Mr. Coleridge) never resorts to *ad captandum* devices to make a point, nor will he accord his *imprimatur* to a single statement which he has not verified." In 1902, it said, "We have no reason whatever to suppose that English vivisectors stay their hands, when confronting a physiological problem, by consideration for their victims. But, in the face of our anti-vivisection movement, it would be too damning to publish accounts of such experiments, and so the blessed word anæsthesia warns off the profane anti-vivisectionist who would rob the altars of science of their victims." Take later instances. In 1903, we find Mr. Wood saying that *we may be sure the narcosis becomes profound when the inspectors knock at the door of the laboratory*; Dr. Brand, saying that *in all experiments, other than inoculations, it is probable that only a whiff of chloroform is given, to satisfy the experimenter's conscience, and to enable him to make humane statements to the public*; and Mr. Berdoo, saying that *vivisectors, where they use anything except curare, employ sham anæsthetics*.

Beside such statements as these, there is the argument from the very rare action of morphia as a stimulant (see *British Medical Journal*, January 14th, 1899); but this argument will not hold good here. The main argument is, that a man who makes experiments on animals is likely enough to tell lies about them. As Mr. Berdoo says, of a very explicit statement about anæsthetics, made by the late Professor Roy, *It is and must be absolutely untrue*. Read again that sentence about the "whiff of chloroform." The phrase is 30 years old; but, like Sir William Fergusson's evidence in 1875, it is still in use. Or take that one phrase—*where they use anything but curare*.

It affords, in six words, a perfect instance of the anti-vivisectionist argument at its lowest level.

---

Other special arguments might be added to the list. For example, there is the argument from the things done on chloralised horses at the veterinary school at Alfort. These practices are not so bad as they used to be ; they are not experiments at all, but the ordinary operations of veterinary surgery, done for the acquirement of experience and of skill ; and they would be illegal in this country, even on animals under profound anæsthesia with chloroform or ether. But they are still quoted, these cruelties years ago in France, as examples of “experiments.”

---

#### IV.—“OUR CAUSE IN PARLIAMENT.”

UNDER this heading the official journal of the National Society reports questions asked in Parliament, and the answers given to them. This aspect of the work of the anti-vivisection societies, and the part taken by them in elections, and their plans to amend or abolish the Act, must be noted here.

In one year, the National Society spent £888 13s. 2d. on “purely electoral work.” That is a very large sum, when we think of *the grave injury done to the cause of mercy by the deplorable waste of money spent in perfectly unnecessary offices and salaries*. The Society’s journal tells us something of this electoral work :—

1899.—“The Parliamentary League has again been successful in its work at bye-elections. At — the two candidates were approached, and both gave more or less satisfactory answers. Sir —’s reply

was thought to be the more satisfactory one, and consequently our supporters gave him their votes. As our readers are aware, he was returned." (In a later number, the *Zoophilist* hints that "further pressure" may be applied to this gentleman in Parliament.)

1900.—"Our readers will be glad to hear that Dr. — is contesting the — Division, and that the Society intends to help him in every way it can in order that we may have a representative in Parliament who is thoroughly conversant with the subject of vivisection, and who will endeavour to get Mr. Coleridge's Bill passed. The efforts of the Society will, however, not be confined to forwarding the interests of any one candidate or any one party. As soon as the names of candidates were announced, Mr. Coleridge issued to all of them a circular letter demanding their views on the vivisection question. The numerous replies which have already arrived, and are still arriving, afford results more gratifying than we for a moment anticipated, and show clearly that we are now recognised throughout Great Britain to be a power that cannot be ignored. . . . On another page will be found an address by our Honorary Secretary, which will be published in the local papers in those constituencies where we consider there is any chance of our votes having an effect on the results at the polls. Volunteer workers are also being dispatched from headquarters to various places. Readers who have votes or who will help in any way are invited to communicate immediately to the head office, when information about the views of their candidates will be at once sent to them."

The London Society also, like the National Society, desires to have a representative in Parliament; and this desire is stated in emphatic words in its latest report. The general tone of that report has already been noted. It loves big black headlines, NO SURRENDER, THE AWAKENING CHURCHES, A TRUCULENT SCIENCE, THE SINEWS OF WAR, THE APPEAL TO THE

PEOPLE. Our present concern is with one paragraph:—

OUR BILL IN PARLIAMENT.

“The question, therefore, arises as to what are the best means for securing the promotion of the Cause. Your Committee can only reiterate with deeper conviction than ever the old watchwords of the Society, EDUCATE! EDUCATE!! EDUCATE!!! In this way public opinion is informed and created, representing a weight which candidates for Parliament, and even Parliament and Government themselves, dare not ignore. The BILL which your Committee promoted five years ago will, in all probability, be introduced in the next session of Parliament, but they would, at the same time, point out very clearly that the greatest chance of success which any such measure can obtain will be best obtained when they can send a medical man into Parliament to pilot the measure through the House of Commons. The subject is one involving very deep and careful study, its ramifications are so various, its pitfalls so numerous, that the average lay member of Parliament has neither the time nor the opportunity to undertake the care and the labour which such a measure involves. For, although the Cause of the Society rests entirely upon a moral basis, the House of Commons is an institution in which this consideration does not always obtain a first and foremost place. The spirit of the age is utilitarian, and though your Society’s Cause may be argued entirely on moral grounds by any independent layman, at the same time it would be a great gain to the Cause if a medical man could be sent to the House of Commons to represent our case, even from the point of view of medical authority.”

They had better send that opponent of vaccination who says that you can bring any member of Parliament to your knees. He would not fail to represent the temper of the London Society; its readiness to



educate everybody, its poor opinion of the *average lay member*, and of the spirit of the age.

And, of course, these societies follow the successful candidates on their subsequent careers. "In Parliament," says the London Society, "the Society's work is carried on as occasion permits. Members of Parliament are written to or are personally seen at the House of Commons. Questions are drafted for them to submit to the Home Secretary, and one or more officers of the Society are in constant attendance at the House of Commons when the question of vivisection is likely to be raised." And the National Society says, "In order to stimulate attention (to Mr. Coleridge's Bill) our lecturer has been assiduous in his attendance in the lobby of the House during the present session, and by personal interviews has been able to arouse a good deal of interest in it on both sides of the House." This was in 1902; and, before the end of the year, Mr. Wood was able to say at Oxford that 140 members of Parliament were pledged to support the Bill. It is evident that "Our Cause in Parliament" is urged with diligence, and is not left to stand or fall according to the unsolicited conscience of the average lay member. Interviewed by this society and that society, prompted and pledged and stimulated, advised this way and that way, any member might say with Mercutio, *A plague o' both your houses*. Take, for example, this system of drafting questions to be put to the Home Secretary. It may or may not take off the edge of sincerity; anyhow, the question should be drafted with great care. On February 26th, 1900, a question was asked as to certain observations which were alleged to have been made on living animals, but in fact had been made on their organs removed after death. The National Society said of this mistake:—

"We wish our readers to know that the question was not prompted by any communication from our Society, and we think it unfortunate that members of Parliament should be asked to put questions in the

House by persons who do not realise that questions based on inaccurate premises can do nothing but harm to our cause. It is hard that the whole anti-vivisection movement should suffer through the carelessness and indolence of those who will neither be at the pains to avoid inaccuracy by their own study and investigation, nor by consulting the National Society's officers."

These careless, indolent, inaccurate persons, who think so lightly of the National Society's officers, and draft a question so silly that the whole cause is damaged, bring us back to the point whence we started: the want of unity between the societies, the frequent jarring of one with another. We have still to see something of the dealings of the National Society with Government; and something of its Bill, now before Parliament, for the amendment of the Act.

It is at its best, doubtless, in the formal letters from Mr. Coleridge to the Home Office; but these, after all, are his own work, and the Society cannot take the credit of them. *Per contra*, we may credit to the Society, and not to Mr. Coleridge, certain threats to Ministers in 1898:—

. . . . "Should we be so unfortunate as to be left by you without such an open assurance, we shall feel it our duty to employ the strength and resources of this Society in an endeavour to prevent your return to Parliament at the next election. We know of a large and increasing number of your constituents who are ready, in the unfortunate event of your being unable to reassure them as to your attitude in the matter of endowing torture, to place humanity above party politics."

. . . . "This Society will feel it to be its duty to use every means in its power to prevent your return to Parliament at the next election."

. . . . "We beg leave to inform you that at the next election the forces of this Society will be used with the utmost vigour to prevent your return to Parlia-

ment. We know of many, and shall no doubt soon secure more of your constituents, pledged to place humanity above party and vote against you on the next occasion that you present yourself."

What are we to think of these three letters? The resources of the Society, given with some vague hope of keeping animals out of pain, are to be used for keeping Ministers out of Parliament. Note the bullying tone of the letters. It is the same thing, two years later, at the General Election, with the heckling of candidates: *We are now recognised throughout Great Britain to be a power that cannot be ignored.* A Society that bullies Ministers of State, what will it not do to the average lay member? *We anti-vivisectionists*, says Mr. Coleridge, two years later still, *form the backbone of all the humane movements in the country.* This backbone of all the movements, this power that cannot be ignored, has got, according to Mr. Somerville Wood, 140 members pledged to support its Bill in Parliament.

The London Society, also, has its own Bill before Parliament, as we have just seen. But we need not do more here than consider the National Society's Bill. It aims at restriction, not at abolition. It was drafted by Mr. Coleridge, and was published in the Society's official journal in March 1899. It has been read once and has been blocked; and they who are wholly outside the political life may wonder at the persistent blocking of a measure which 140 members are pledged to support.

That we may understand this Bill, we must first look at the present Act.

#### ACT 39 & 40 VIC. c. 77.

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend the law relating to cruelty to animals by extending it to the cases of animals which for medical, physiological or other scientific purposes are subjected when alive to experiments calculated to inflict pain:

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent

Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :

1. This Act may be cited for all purposes as ‘ The Short title.  
Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876.’

2. A person shall not perform on a living animal any experiment calculated to give pain, except subject to the restrictions imposed by this Act. Prohibition of painful experiments on animals. Any person performing or taking part in performing any experiment calculated to give pain, in contravention of this Act, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act, and shall, if it be the first offence, be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, and if it be the second or any subsequent offence, be liable, at the discretion of the court by which he is tried, to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months.

3. The following restrictions are imposed by this Act with respect to the performance on any living animal of an experiment calculated to give pain ; that is to say, General restrictions as to performance of painful experiments on animals.

(1) The experiment must be performed with a view to the advancement by new discovery of physiological knowledge or of knowledge which will be useful for saving or prolonging life or alleviating suffering ; and

(2) The experiment must be performed by a person holding such license from one of Her Majesty’s Principal Secretaries of State, in this Act referred to as the Secretary of State, as is in this Act mentioned, and in the case of a person holding such conditional license as is hereinafter mentioned, or of experiments performed for the purpose of instruction in a registered place ; and

(3) The animal must during the whole of the experiment be under the influence of some anæsthetic of sufficient power to prevent the animal feeling pain ; and

(4) The animal must, if the pain is likely to continue after the effect of the anæsthetic

has ceased, or if any serious injury has been inflicted on the animal, be killed before it recovers from the influence of the anæsthetic which has been administered ; and

5) The experiment shall not be performed as an illustration of lectures in medical schools, hospitals, colleges, or elsewhere ; and

(6) The experiment shall not be performed for the purpose of attaining manual skill.

Provided as follows ; that is to say,

(1) Experiments may be performed under the foregoing provisions as to the use of anæsthetics by a person giving illustrations of lectures in medical schools, hospitals, or colleges, or elsewhere, on such certificate being given as in this Act mentioned, that the proposed experiments are absolutely necessary for the due instruction of the persons to whom such lectures are given with a view to their acquiring physiological knowledge or knowledge which will be useful to them for saving or prolonging life or alleviating suffering ; and

(2) Experiments may be performed without anæsthetics on such certificate being given as in this Act mentioned that insensibility cannot be produced without necessarily frustrating the object of such experiments ; and

(3) Experiments may be performed without the person who performed such experiments being under an obligation to cause the animal on which any such experiment is performed to be killed before it recovers from the influence of the anæsthetic on such certificate being given as in this Act mentioned, that the so killing the animal would necessarily frustrate the object of the experiment, and provided that the animal be killed as soon as such object has been attained ; and

(4) Experiments may be performed not directly for the advancement by new discovery



of physiological knowledge, or of knowledge which will be useful for saving or prolonging life or alleviating suffering, but for the purpose of testing a particular former discovery alleged to have been made for the advancement of such knowledge as last aforesaid, on such certificate being given as is in this Act mentioned that such testing is absolutely necessary for the effectual advancement of such knowledge.

4. The substance known as urari or curare shall not for the purposes of this Act be deemed to be an anæsthetic. Use of urari as an anæsthetic prohibited.

5. Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, an experiment calculated to give pain shall not be performed without anæsthetics on a dog, or cat, except on such certificate being given as in this Act mentioned, stating, in addition to the statements herein-before required to be made in such certificate, that for reasons specified in the certificate the object of the experiment will be necessarily frustrated unless it is performed on an animal similar in constitution and habits to a cat or dog, and no other animal is available for such experiment; and an experiment calculated to give pain shall not be performed on any horse, ass, or mule, except on such certificate being given as in this Act mentioned that the object of the experiment will be necessarily frustrated unless it is performed on a horse, ass, or mule, and that no other animal is available for such experiment. Special restrictions on painful experiments on dogs, cats, etc.

6. Any exhibition to the general public, whether admitted on payment of money or gratuitously, of experiments on living animals calculated to give pain shall be illegal. Absolute prohibition of public exhibition of painful experiments.

Any person performing or aiding in performing such experiments shall be deemed to be guilty of an offence against this Act, and shall, if it be the first offence, be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds, and if it be the second or any subsequent offence, be liable, at the discretion of the court by which he is tried, to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months.

And any person publishing any notice of any such intended exhibition by advertisement in a

newspaper, placard, or otherwise, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one pound.

A person punished for an offence under this section shall not for the same offence be punishable under any other section of this Act.

*Administration of Law.*

Registry of  
place for  
performance  
of experi-  
ments.

7. The Secretary of State may insert, as a condition of granting any license, a provision in such license that the place in which any experiment is to be performed by the licensee is to be registered in such manner as the Secretary of State may from time to time by any general or special order direct ; provided that every place for the performance of experiments for the purpose of instruction under this Act shall be approved by the Secretary of State, and shall be registered in such manner as he may from time to time by any general or special order direct.

License by  
Secretary of  
State.

8. The Secretary of State may license any person whom he may think qualified to hold a license to perform experiments under this Act. A license granted by him may be for such time as he may think fit, and may be revoked by him on his being satisfied that such license ought to be revoked. There may be annexed to such license any conditions which the Secretary of State may think expedient for the purpose of better carrying into effect the objects of this Act, but not inconsistent with the provisions thereof.

Reports to  
Secretary of  
State.

9. The Secretary of State may direct any person performing experiments under this Act from time to time to make such reports to him of the result of such experiments, in such form and with such details as he may require.

Inspection  
by Secretary  
of State.

10. The Secretary of State shall cause all registered places to be from time to time visited by inspectors for the purpose of securing a compliance with the provisions of this Act, and the Secretary of State may, with the assent of the Treasury as to number, appoint any special inspectors, or may from time to time assign the duties of any such inspectors to such officers in the employment of the Government, who may be willing to accept the same, as he may think fit, either permanently or temporarily.

11. Any application for a license under this Act and a certificate given as in this Act mentioned must be signed by one or more of the following persons ; that is to say,

Certificate of scientific bodies for exceptions to general regulations.

The President of the Royal Society ;  
The President of the Royal Society of Edinburgh ;  
The President of the Royal Irish Academy ;  
The Presidents of the Royal Colleges of Surgeons in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin ;  
The Presidents of the Royal Colleges of Physicians in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin ;  
The President of the General Medical Council ;  
The President of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow ;  
The President of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, or the President of the Royal Veterinary College, London, but in the case only of an experiment to be performed under anæsthetics with a view to the advancement by new discovery of veterinary science ;

and also (unless the applicant be a professor of physiology, medicine, anatomy, medical jurisprudence, materia medica, or surgery in a university in Great Britain or Ireland, or in University College, London, or in a college in Great Britain or Ireland, incorporated by royal charter) by a professor of physiology, medicine, anatomy, medical jurisprudence, materia medica, or surgery in a university in Great Britain or Ireland, or in University College, London, or in a college in Great Britain or Ireland, incorporated by royal charter.

Provided that where any person applying for a certificate under this Act is himself one of the persons authorised to sign such certificate, the signature of some other of such persons shall be substituted for the signature of the applicant.

A certificate under this section may be given for such time or for such series of experiments as the person or persons signing the certificate may think expedient.

A copy of any certificate under this section shall be forwarded by the applicant to the Secretary of State, but shall not be available until one week after a copy has been so forwarded.

The Secretary of State may at any time disallow or suspend any certificate given under this section.

Power of judge to grant license for experiment when necessary in criminal case.

12. The powers conferred by this Act of granting a license or giving a certificate for the performance of experiments on living animals may be exercised by an order in writing under the hand of any judge of the High Court of Justice in England, of the High Court of Session in Scotland, or of any of the superior courts in Ireland, including any court to which the jurisdiction of such last-mentioned courts may be transferred, in a case where such judge is satisfied that it is essential for the purposes of justice in a criminal case to make any such experiment.

#### *Legal Proceedings.*

Entry on warrant by justice.

13. A justice of the peace, on information on oath that there is reasonable ground to believe that experiments in contravention of this Act are being performed by an unlicensed person in any place not registered under this Act may issue his warrant authorising any officer or constable of police to enter and search such place, and to take the names and addresses of the persons found therein.

Any person who refuses admission on demand to a police officer or constable so authorised, or obstructs such officer or constable in the execution of his duty under this section, or who refuses on demand to disclose his name or address, or gives a false name or address, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds.

Prosecution of offences and recovery of penalties in England.

14. In England, offences against this Act may be prosecuted, and penalties under this Act recovered before a court of summary jurisdiction in manner directed by the Summary Jurisdiction Act.

In England "Summary Jurisdiction Act" means the Act of the session of the eleventh and twelfth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter forty-three, intituled "An Act to facilitate the performance of the duties of justices of the peace out of sessions within England and Wales with respect to summary convictions and orders," and any Act amending the same.

“ Court of summary jurisdiction ” means and includes any justice or justices of the peace, metropolitan police magistrate, stipendiary or other magistrate, or officer, by whatever name called, exercising jurisdiction in pursuance of the Summary Jurisdiction Act: Provided that the court when hearing and determining an information under this Act shall be constituted either of two or more justices of the peace in petty sessions, sitting at a place appointed for holding petty sessions, or of some magistrate or officer sitting alone or with others at some court or other place appointed for the administration of justice, and for the time being empowered by law to do alone any act authorised to be done by more than one justice of the peace.

15. In England, where a person is accused before a court of summary jurisdiction of any offence against this Act in respect of which a penalty of more than five pounds can be imposed, the accused may, on appearing before the court of summary jurisdiction, declare that he objects to being tried for such offence by a court of summary jurisdiction, and thereupon the court of summary jurisdiction may deal with the case in all respects as if the accused were charged with an indictable offence and not an offence punishable on summary conviction, and the offence may be prosecuted on indictment accordingly.

“ Court of summary jurisdiction.”

Power of offender in England to elect to be tried on indictment, and not by summary jurisdiction..

16. In England, if any party thinks himself aggrieved by any conviction made by a court of summary jurisdiction on determining any information under this Act, the party so aggrieved may appeal therefrom, subject to the conditions and regulations following:

Form of appeal to quarter sessions.

- (1) The appeal shall be made to the next court of general or quarter sessions for the county or place in which the cause of appeal has arisen, holden not less than twenty-one days after the decision of the court from which the appeal is made; and
- (2) The appellant shall, within ten days after the cause of appeal has arisen, give notice to the other party and to the court of



summary jurisdiction of his intention to appeal, and of the ground thereof; and

- (3) The appellant shall, within three days after such notice, enter into a recognisance before a justice of the peace, with two sufficient sureties, conditioned personally to try such appeal, and to abide the judgment of the court thereon, and to pay such costs as may be awarded by the court, or give such other security by deposit of money or otherwise as the justice may allow; and
- (4) Where the appellant is in custody the justice may, if he think fit, on the appellant entering into such recognisance or giving such other security as aforesaid, release him from custody; and
- (5) The court of appeal may adjourn the appeal, and upon the hearing thereof they may confirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the court of summary jurisdiction, or remit the matter to the court of summary jurisdiction with the opinion of the court of appeal thereon, or make such other order in the matter as the court thinks just, and if the matter be remitted to the court of summary jurisdiction the said last-mentioned court shall thereupon rehear and decide the information in accordance with the order of the said court of appeal. The court of appeal may also make such order as to costs to be paid by either party as the court thinks just.

Prosecution  
of offences  
and recovery  
of penalties  
in Scotland.

17. In Scotland, offences against this Act may be prosecuted and penalties under this Act recovered under the provisions of the Summary Procedure Act, 1864, or if a person accused of any offence against this Act in respect of which a penalty of more than five pounds can be imposed, on appearing before a court of summary jurisdiction, declare that he objects to being tried for such offence in the court of summary jurisdiction, proceedings may be taken against him on indictment in the Court of Justiciary in Edinburgh or on circuit.

Every person found liable in any penalty or costs shall be liable in default of immediate payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding

three months, or until such penalty or costs are sooner paid.

18. In Ireland, offences against this Act may be prosecuted and penalties under this Act recovered in a summary manner, subject and according to the provisions with respect to the prosecution of offences, the recovery of penalties, and to appeal of the Petty Sessions (Ireland) Act, 1851, and any Act amending the same, and in Dublin of the Acts regulating the powers of justices of the peace or of the police of Dublin metropolis. All penalties recovered under this Act shall be applied in manner directed by the Fines (Ireland) Act, 1871, and any Act amending the same.

Prosecution of offences and recovery of penalties in Ireland.

19. In Ireland, where a person is accused before a court of summary jurisdiction of any offence against this Act in respect of which a penalty of more than five pounds can be imposed, the accused may, on appearing before the court of summary jurisdiction, declare that he objects to being tried for such offence by a court of summary jurisdiction, and thereupon the court of summary jurisdiction may deal with the case in all respects as if the accused were charged with an indictable offence and not an offence punishable on summary conviction, and the offence may be prosecuted on indictment accordingly.

Power of offender in Ireland to elect to be tried on indictment, and not by summary jurisdiction.

20. In the application of this Act to Ireland the term "the Secretary of State" shall be construed to mean the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland for the time being.

Interpretation of "the Secretary of State" as to Ireland.

21. A prosecution under this Act against a licensed person shall not be instituted except with the assent in writing of the Secretary of State.

Prosecution only with leave of Secretary of State.

22. This Act shall not apply to invertebrate animals.

Not to apply to invertebrate animals.

Now let us see in what spirit this Act is administered. Take the statement made last year in Parliament by the Home Secretary. "As a result," says the National Society, "of the persistent Parliamentary

and Lobbying work that has been undertaken by the National Anti-vivisection Society during the present session, a most interesting debate took place in the House of Commons on Thursday, June 25th (1903). . . . . The Home Secretary's admission that the number of inspectors might be increased may be regarded as a distinct step in the right direction, and is undoubtedly due to the untiring work of the Society and its friends, both in and out of Parliament." Four days later, June 29th, the Society's Honorary Secretary said *I appeal to all humane societies to gather their forces together to go down with all their strength into Kent and turn him out of Parliament.* This, surely, was rather hard on one of His Majesty's ministers, who had just taken, as a result of the untiring work of the Society and its friends, a distinct step in the right direction. But we are concerned here only with what Mr. Akers-Douglas said at this debate on June 25th. It is the fullest statement that has been made for many years by any Home Secretary, as to the administration of the Act:—

"All he had to do was to administer the law as he found it, but he could assure the Committee that he had taken the greatest precautions in that administration, and that he thoroughly appreciated the responsibility which devolved upon him. There was nothing that appealed to a man more than the great sense of responsibility which was felt in connection with the administration of this Act. (Hear, hear.) He was a lover of dogs and other animals himself, and he should be the last person to allow any suffering to be inflicted on them. (Hear, hear.) He should like to explain to the Committee what was the practice in the Home Office. Applications for all licenses always came before the Home Secretary personally, and they were carefully inquired into by him. No license was granted except on the recommendation of an eminent medical man, such as the president of the College of Physicians or the president of the College of Surgeons, or without reference to the

Society for the Propagation of Scientific Research. Care was taken to see that the licensee was a person whose qualifications were undoubted, whose *bona fides* was beyond dispute, and whose desire for purely scientific research was unquestioned. The Secretary of State never allowed an experiment unless he was satisfied that it was for a proper and an adequately scientific object, and unless it was performed by a properly-trained and competent person, and could be conducted with every precaution against unnecessary pain being inflicted. The experiments were divided into three classes. In the first class the animal was under complete anæsthesia from the beginning to the end of the experiment, and was painlessly killed before it became conscious. In such cases no pain whatever could be inflicted. Those cases were one-eighth of the whole. In the second class of cases the animal was under complete anæsthesia during the experiments, but was allowed to recover consciousness and to live under observation, so that the effect of the operation might be noted. The experiments in this class were very few in number, but were of the greatest importance. They were most fruitful in increasing scientific knowledge, and led to the amelioration of human suffering and the curing of disease. Those experiments were allowed only on rare occasions, and the strictest precautions were taken. The third class of experiments were performed without anæsthetics. In this class no experiment whatever was allowed which involved greater pain than that caused by a simple hypodermic injection. It would be almost absurd to describe the prick of an inoculating needle as an operation. Even in these operations the animal was destroyed at once if any pain resulted. When the license was granted the licensee was bound to make reports to the inspector. He was always liable to visits from the inspector, and those visits were practically always surprise visits. As an additional security, no experiments were allowed in private places. Nearly

always they were allowed only in great medical schools and in the laboratories of pathological institutions. Last year 319 persons were licensed, of whom 112 did not perform any experiment. It was true that there was an increase of 62, but that increase was due to an alteration in the termination of the year during which the statistics were taken. Hitherto the statistics had been taken from December 31st to December 31st; but the last report dated from December 31st, 1901, to February 28th, 1903. There were 26 towns in the United Kingdom in which registered places were situated, and in those only could experiments be performed. Of the 62 registered places in those towns 17 were in London. Every registered place was visited by the inspector every year, and sometimes many times a year, and the inspector was in constant communication with the licensees all over the country. It was the duty of the inspector to make himself personally acquainted with the methods by which experiments were performed, and wherever the conditions of the license were violated the severest notice was taken of it and the license was revoked. Successive Secretaries of State had inclined to the view that the appointment of additional inspectors was not necessary. If it could be proved to him that there was immediate necessity for the appointment of additional inspectors, he should certainly see that they were appointed. Successive Home Secretaries had been among the severest critics of vivisection. They had not been content to take things for granted, but had taken an interest in seeing that precautions were properly observed. There was no reason whatever to think that this matter was left entirely in the hands of the inspectors without its coming to the knowledge of the head of the department. The third class were experiments in the nature of simple inoculations, which rarely caused any real suffering, and were conducted with the greatest possible care. They were performed not only for purposes of research in connection



with special scientific objects, but were constantly performed for the public offices. Some were undertaken for the benefit of the House of Commons itself in order to test the conditions under which hon. members lived there, some for the Local Government Board, some for the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis, some for the Board of Agriculture, others for county councils and other municipal corporations. They had all been justified by the results obtained. His own control was exercised with the greatest care and full appreciation of his responsibility. He was always open to criticism, and when any *bona-fide* case was submitted to him he would see that it was probed to the bottom. It would be almost impossible to improve upon the administration of the Acts unless, as might be possible, they were to increase the number of inspectors. He doubted whether the ability of the inspectors was sufficiently recognised, and whether they were adequately remunerated, considering their ability and the amount of work they did."

Surely, with this statement before us, the wonder is that the anti-vivisection societies should still work against the Act. But they must be at work. Nothing, or next to nothing, has come of lectures and pamphlets all these many years. The opposition against experiments on animals has increased in extent, but not in depth. Branch-associations have been established far and wide; every town in the kingdom has been diligently lectured; many members have been enrolled, and innumerable meetings have been held; and, all along, on the side of the societies, has been the steady increase of the spirit of thought for animals, gentleness to all animals, reverence of the life of animals. But, for all that, the anti-vivisection societies have neither hindered experiments on animals, nor gained ground, of late years, in public opinion. Time is beginning to tell upon them; we have heard so many times of Schiff and Mantegazza, and Bell and Fergusson, and the 1875 Commission, and what Claude Bernard and Lord Tennyson

said about curare. Therefore, the anti-vivisection societies are forced to fight the Act; they must put forth their full strength, must do their best to win an engagement once and for all; nobody cares to see them fighting the Home Office, nobody approves them for fighting the Hospitals; but they can still get a good deal of sympathy for a fight against the Act. We need not stop to consider how the London Society fights it; we can agree with the National Society, that the policy of the London Society, the demand for abolition, is impracticable. Let us consider the policy of the National Society, the demand for more restriction, and Mr. Coleridge's Bill.

The text of this Bill, in March 1899, was as follows :

WHEREAS it is expedient to amend The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, hereinafter referred to as the Principal Act.

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :

1. The Principal Act shall as from the commencement of this Act take effect subject to the additions, omissions, and substitutions required by this Act, but nothing in this Act shall affect any act done or omitted or liability incurred before the commencement of this Act.

2. This Act may be cited as "The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1899," and shall be construed together with the Principal Act as part thereof, and this Act and the Principal Act may be cited collectively as "The Cruelty to Animals Acts, 1876 and 1899."

3. For Section 3 of the Principal Act the following Section shall be substituted, namely :

3. The performance upon living animals of an experiment calculated to give pain shall be subject to the following restrictions, that is to say :

(1) The experiment must be performed with a view to the advancement by new discovery of Physiological knowledge, or of knowledge which will be useful for saving or prolonging life, or alleviating suffering

- (2) The experiment must be performed by a person holding such license from the Secretary of State as is in this Act as amended by The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1899, mentioned ;
- (3) The animal must, prior to the commencement, and thenceforth during the whole course of the experiment be under the influence of a general anæsthetic of the nature of a respirable drug or gas, such as Chloroform or Ether, or Chloroform and Ether combined, of sufficient power to prevent the animal feeling pain ;
- (4) The animal must be killed whilst it is so under the influence of such general anæsthetic as aforesaid, and before it recovers therefrom sufficiently to feel pain ;
- (5) The experiment shall not be performed as an illustration of lectures in any medical or surgical school, hospital, college, or elsewhere ;
- (6) The experiment shall not be performed for the purpose of attaining manual skill ;
- (7) The substance known as Curare shall not be used or administered for the purpose of or during the experiment ;
- (8) There shall be present during and throughout the whole course of every experiment by way of vivisection an Inspector appointed under the provisions of this Act as amended by The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1899, are fulfilled, and no such experiment shall at any time be performed or continued save in the presence of such Inspector as aforesaid.

4. Section 5 of the Principal Act is hereby repealed.

5. There shall be omitted from Section 7 of the Principal Act the portion beginning with the words " Provided that every place " down to the end of the Section.

6. For Section 8 of the Principal Act the following Section shall be substituted, namely :

8. The Secretary of State may license any person whom he may think qualified to hold a license to perform, subject to the restrictions aforesaid, experiments upon living animals calculated to give pain, provided that--

- (1) No license granted hereunder shall authorise the

performance of more than one experiment to be specified in such license, or one series of not more than six connected and consecutive experiments of a nature to be so specified.

- (2) Every license granted hereunder shall specify the time and place at which the experiment or series of experiments is or are to be performed.
- (3) Three copies of every license granted hereunder shall be filed and shall immediately after the grant thereof be deposited respectively in the Library of the House of Lords, in the Library of the House of Commons, and in such place accessible to the public as the Secretary of State may determine; and any person shall, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed, be entitled at all reasonable times to search the file of the copies of such licenses deposited in the last mentioned place upon payment of a fee of one shilling or such other fee as may be prescribed.
- (4) A license granted hereunder may be revoked or suspended at any time by the Secretary of State if he shall think fit.

7. For Section 9 of the Principal Act, the following Section shall be substituted, namely :

- (9) The Secretary of State shall direct every licensed person performing any such experiment as aforesaid to make a detailed chronological report to him in writing of the description, course and result of each experiment. Such report shall be made in a form in accordance with the form of report in the Schedule to The Cruelty to Animals Act, 1899, annexed, with such variations as circumstances may require, and it shall be transmitted to the Secretary of State within 7 days after the completion of each experiment, and shall be published in the London Gazette within two months after its receipt by the Secretary of State.

8. For Section 10 of the Principal Act, the following Section shall be substituted, namely :

- (10) The Secretary of State shall, with the assent of the Treasury as to number, appoint a sufficient number of Inspectors to carry out the provisions of this Act as amended by The Cruelty to Animals

Act, 1899, or he may from time to time assign the duties of such Inspectors to such officers in the employment of the Government who may be willing to accept the same as he may think fit either permanently or temporarily.

9. There shall be omitted from Section 11 of the Principal Act the following words and portion of that Section, namely :

The words " And a certificate given as in this Act mentioned," and the portion beginning with the words " Provided that where any person " down to the end of the Section.

10. There shall be omitted from Section 12 of the Principal Act the words " or giving a certificate."

11. There shall be omitted from Section 13 of the Principal Act the words " by an unlicensed person," and the words " not registered under this Act."

12. This Act shall come into operation upon the 1st day of October, 1899.

Let us examine the main provisions of this Bill. Six out of every seven experiments, at the present time, are inoculations, or of the nature of inoculations. How does this Bill deal with inoculations ? What does it say of this 85 per cent. of all experiments on animals ? By Section 3, paragraph 4, it seems to prevent, absolutely, all inoculations. But, in an explanatory note, Mr. Coleridge says :—

" We feel it to be our clear duty, if it be necessary to secure the passing of this Bill, thereby to accept an amendment, should one be submitted, excluding inoculations from the provisions of the Bill if the amendment expressly forbids inoculations in the eye."

Inoculations in the eye sound cruel ;<sup>1</sup> but it is certain that a man may have blood or pus (hypopyon) in the anterior chamber of the eye, and hardly be conscious of it. The surface of the eye is very sensitive, but cocain makes it insensitive ; the anterior chamber is by nature almost insensitive. Anyhow,

<sup>1</sup> One of the chief opponents of all experiments on animals, a medical practitioner, says that the ciliary region of the eye is the region of the eye-lashes.



the three instances usually quoted of this method are many years old : one is five years old, another is fifteen. But what is to be said of this plan to "accept an amendment excluding inoculations from the provisions of the Bill" ? What should we think of a Compulsory Temperance Bill, which would accept an amendment, should one be submitted, excluding beer and spirits from the provisions of the Bill ?

Next, how does this Bill deal with those experiments which are made under Certificate B ? It absolutely prevents them. As Mr. Wood said last year : "The Society intended to bring before Parliament what he would call a sweetly-reasonable measure. This would make vivisection very difficult ; but *it was their object to put as many obstacles in its way as possible.*" That is their object : and it explains the Bill, which certainly wants explanation. It is five years old : it was drafted before March 1899. We get glimpses of it, between then and now, in the National Society's journal. In June 1899 we read that every inoculation need not be made in the presence of a Government Inspector. In October 1899 Mr. Wood expresses a hope that the Bill will be passed soon. In June 1900 we hear that the Bill has been altered, "in order the better to insure the total prohibition of painful inoculation experiments," and that it has not come before Parliament because so much of the time of the House of Commons has been spent over the War. In November 1900 we read : "It is unfortunately unlikely that Mr. Coleridge's Bill will become law so long as the leaders in both Houses are so notoriously pro-vivisectionist as are Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour." In June 1902 it was read a first time. A little later, Mr. Bartley's amendment was set down, annulling it : and, about this time, one of the most important of the Society's Vice-Presidents withdrew his name from office. In December 1902 the Society's Lecturer, attacking another anti-vivisection society, said that he hoped the Bill would become law "in the near future." In February 1903 it was again read a first

time in the House of Commons. It was afterwards blocked, apparently in the interests of another anti-vivisection society.

Let us look at it once more. It demands a whole legion of Inspectors. Every single experiment is to be watched. The thing is impossible: the Home Office could not get such an army of experts to hang about the laboratories to please an anti-vivisection society. Every license is to be filed at Somerset House, or some such place, where the emissary of an anti-vivisection society can hunt up names and addresses of licensees. Every experiment is to be published, full length, in the *London Gazette*: and why not in the *Athenæum* and the *Referée*? And morphia, though it can anæsthetise a man to death, is not to be used to keep a rabbit out of pain. Was there ever such a Bill? How can we take it seriously? It is, or was in 1899, wholly fantastic and extravagant, with its proposal to "accept an amendment" involving six experiments out of every seven, and its absolute prohibition of the very experiments which are, as the Home Secretary said lately, "very few in number, but of the greatest importance: they are most fruitful in increasing scientific knowledge, and lead to the amelioration of human suffering and the curing of disease." This Bill may be blocked for years to come; or it may, some day, get a hearing in Parliament. That other Bill, the London Society's Bill, which is irreconcilable with Mr. Coleridge's Bill, is also before Parliament. Anyhow, we must wait. Perhaps, sooner or later, the Home Office will create one or two more Inspectorships. When that happens, the National Society will doubtless claim the credit for this "step in the right direction," and will say that it has not lived in vain. And when Mr. Coleridge's Bill does come to be discussed in the House of Commons, we shall see how many of those 140 members who once were pledged to support it are of the same opinion still.

## A HISTORICAL PARALLEL.

We have now seen something of the electoral and Parliamentary methods of these societies; and we have already seen something of their general methods, literature, and arguments. It is a long way, from the plain duty to take care of animals, to the arguments and general behaviour of these societies. Of course, we have seen them here from the most unfavourable point of view. From that point of view, apart from any more favourable aspect, they have their parallel in history. The two instances are, in some ways, very unlike: but the parallelism is worthy of note. The historical instance is more than fifty years old: we have what was said, in 1851, against his worst opponents, by a man who had an unpopular cause to defend. It does not matter, here, who he was, or what was his cause, or how it has fared since 1851. But his sayings, some of them, seem apt to our present subject. Take the following examples. Only, here and there, a word is altered, or a phrase left out, that all offence may be avoided:—

“ . . . . We should have cause to congratulate ourselves, though we were able to proceed no further than to persuade our opponents to argue out one point before going on to another. It would be much even to get them to give up what they could not defend, and to promise that they would not return to it. It would be much to succeed in hindering them from making a great deal of an objection till it is refuted, and then suddenly considering it so small that it is not worth withdrawing. It would be much to hinder them from eluding a defeat on one point by digressing upon three or four others, and then presently running back to the first, and then to and fro, to second, third, and fourth, and treating each in turn as if quite a fresh subject on which not a word had yet been said.”

“ . . . . No evidence against us is too little: no

infliction too great. Statement without proof, though inadmissible in every other case, is all fair when we are concerned. An opponent is at liberty to bring a charge against us, and challenge us to refute, not any proof he brings, for he brings none, but his simple assumption or assertion. And perhaps we accept his challenge, and then we find we have to deal with matters so vague or so minute, so general or so particular, that we are at our wits' end to know how to grapple with them."

. . . . "For myself, I never should have been surprised, if, in the course of the last nine months of persecution, some scandal in this or that part of our cause had been brought to light and circulated through the country to our great prejudice. No such calamity has occurred: but oh! what would not our enemies have paid for only one real and live sin to mock us withal. Their fierce and unblushing effort to fix such charges where they were impossible, shows how many eyes were fastened on us all over the country, and how deep and fervent was the aspiration that some among us might turn out to be a brute or a villain."

. . . . "The people love story-books, and do not like dry matters of fact. How dull is history, or biography, or controversy, compared with a good romance, the lives of highwaymen, a collection of ghost-stories, a melodrama, a wild-beast show, or an execution. What would a Sunday newspaper be without trials, accidents, and offences? Therefore we are dressed up like a scarecrow to gratify, on a large scale, the passions of curiosity, fright, and hatred. Something or other men must fear, men must loathe, men must suspect, even if it be to turn away their minds from their own inward miseries. . . . A calumny against us first appeared in 1836, it still thrives and flourishes in 1851. I have made inquiries, and I am told I may safely say that in the course of the fifteen years that it has lasted, from 200,000 to 250,000 copies have been put into circulation in

America and England. A vast number of copies has been sold at a cheap rate, and given away by persons who ought to have known that it was a mere fiction. I hear rumours concerning some of the distributors, which, from the respect which I wish to entertain towards their names, I do not know how to credit."

. . . . "The perpetual talk against us does not become truer because it is incessant; but it continually deepens the impression, in the minds of those who hear it, that we are impostors. There is no increase of logical cogency; a lie is a lie just as much the tenth time it is told as the first; or rather more, it is ten lies instead of one; but it gains in rhetorical influence. . . . Thus the meetings and preachings which are ever going on against us on all sides, though they may have no argumentative force whatever, are still immense factories for the creation of prejudice."

. . . . "The Prejudiced Man takes it for granted that we, who differ from him, are universally impostors, tyrants, hypocrites, cowards, and slaves. If he meets with any story against us, on any or no authority, which does but fall in with this notion of us, he eagerly catches at it. Authority goes for nothing; likelihood, as he considers it, does instead of testimony; what he is now told is just what he expected. Perhaps it is a random report, put into circulation merely because it had a chance of succeeding, or thrown like a straw to the wind; perhaps it is a mere publisher's speculation, who thinks that a narrative of horrors will pay well for the printing: it matters not, he is equally convinced of its truth: he knows all about it beforehand; it is just what he always has said; it is the old tale over again a hundred times. Accordingly he buys it by the thousand, and sends it about with all speed in every direction, to his circle of friends and acquaintance, to the newspapers, to the great speakers at public meetings. . . . Next comes an absolute, explicit, total denial or refutation of the precious calumny, whatever it may



be, on unimpeachable authority. The Prejudiced Man simply discredits this denial, and puts it aside, not receiving any impression from it at all, or paying it the slightest attention. This, if he can : if he cannot, if it is urged upon him by some friend, or brought up against him by some opponent, he draws himself up, looks sternly at the objector, and then says the very same thing as before, only with a louder voice and more confident manner. He becomes more intensely and enthusiastically positive, by way of making up for the interruption, of braving the confutation, and of showing the world that nothing whatever in the universe will ever make him think one hair-breadth more favourably than he does think, than he ever has thought, and than his family ever thought before him. About our state of mind, our views of things, our ends and objects, our doctrines, our defence of them, he absolutely refuses to be enlightened. . . . The most overwhelming refutations of the calumnies brought against us do us no good at all. We were tempted, perhaps, to say to ourselves, 'What *will* they have to say in answer to this ? Now at last the falsehood is put down for ever, it will never show its face again.' Vain hope ! Such is the virtue of prejudice—it is ever reproductive ; future story-tellers and wonder-mongers, as yet unknown to fame, are below the horizon, and will unfold their tale of horror, each in his day, in long succession."

. . . . "Perhaps it is wrong to compare sin with sin, but I declare to you, the more I think of it, the more intimately does this Prejudice seem to me to corrupt the soul, even beyond those sins which are commonly called more deadly. And why ? because it argues so astonishing a want of mere natural charity or love of our kind. They can be considerate in all matters of this life, friendly in social intercourse, charitable to the poor and outcast, merciful towards criminals, nay, kind towards the inferior creation, towards their cows, and horses, and swine ; yet, as regards us, who bear the same form, speak the same

tongue, breathe the same air, and walk the same streets, ruthless, relentless, believing ill of us, and wishing to believe it. They are tenacious of what they believe, they are impatient of being argued with, they are angry at being contradicted, they are disappointed when a point is cleared up; they had rather that *we* should be guilty than *they* mistaken; they have no wish at all we should not be unprincipled rogues and bloodthirsty demons. They are kinder even to their dogs and their cats than to us. Is it not true? can it be denied? is it not portentous? does it not argue an incompleteness or hiatus in the very structure of their moral nature? has not something, in their case, dropped out of the list of natural qualities proper to man?"

---

These sentences, many of them, might be used now to describe Anti-vivisection at its lowest level. It can attain a higher level than that: but we have seen that the literature, arguments, and general methods of the Anti-vivisection Societies do not always keep the higher level. The Parliamentary interviewer, the itinerant lecturer, and the letter-writer, are not, after all, of much help to any cause: and surely it is time, after all these wasted years of opposition, that the matter should be left to the men of science and the doctors, to the law of the land, and to the discretion of the Home Office.



